BB-12-9

THE SEVERAL WAYS Of Resolving FAITH By the Controvertists of the ROMAN and REFORMED RELIGION.

With the Authors Impartial Thoughts of Each of them.

And his own Opinion at length shewn, wherein he conceives the *Rule* of FAITH doth consist.

The Second Edition.

Enlarged in several of its Sections; with the Addition also of an *Appendix* of divers *Objections* and their *Answers*: And an *Explanation* of the different *Acceptations* of the word *TRADITION* as it is used in the BOOK.

By a *LAY-MAN.*

LONDON,
Printed for *H. Faithorne*, and *J. Kersey*, at the *Rose* in S. *Paul*'s Church-yard, 1682.

1976 : 15

73 f. 2

THE PUBLISHER TO THE Pious and Intelligent READER.

IF, Reader, thou be indeed ſo qualified, as the ſtyle I give thee, imports, the following Treatiſe will, I am confident, find a very grateful acceptance with thee. For as the Subject of it's Diſcourſe is of higheſt Conſequence, and ſo eſteem'd by all who have a greater value for the Truth of Chriſtianity, than for the Concern of ſecular Intereſts and Enjoyments; ſo will the handling of it be, with that impartiality, ſincerity, and ſerioufneſs ſeen perform'd, that thou'lt eaſily own it to be a Tract wholly deſign'd for conviction

on and ſatisfaction, not at all for contention or oſtentation. This, 'tis true, makes it appear in a plain and homely dreſs, the Author having purpoſely declin'd Rhetorical Ornaments as fitter for an Eloquent inſinuating Harangue, than for a controverſial ſtrict Diſcourſe, whoſe aim and intent ſhould not be to pleaſe the fancy with gay and empty appearances, but to fix the Underſtanding with plain and ſolid Truths. Whereunto how far this ſmall Piece in what it treats of, is conducible, I ſhall wholly leave to thy own impartial thoughts to judge. Permit me yet (which with modeſty enough, I may crave) to uſe the freedom to tell thee, that the Way the Author takes for effecting his deſire (which is to be confirm'd upon ſure Grounds, What the Means inſtituted by God, for attaining to the certain knowlede of Chriſts Doctrine be) is ſuch, that nothing but very calumny can accuſe him of any ſiniſter or partial proceeding. This although a Motive material for recommending the peruſal of his Book, eſpecially conſidering how polemick Diſputes are too frequently

manag'd;

manag'd; yet was my apprehenſion of the ſoundneſs of the Diſcourſe it ſelf, and of the great aſſiſtance it brings to the rational defence of the truly Proteſtant Profeſſion (but not of whatſoever is ſo call'd by every Opinioniſt) the principal Inducement that mov'd me (with my friends permiſſion) to publiſh it. I ſpeak not this (Courteous Reader) to foreſtall in the leaſt thy Judgment, but remit thee to thy full liberty; and the rather, becauſe to do otherwiſe, were to offer violence to the nature of the Treatiſe it ſelf, whoſe entire complexion, in the whole and every part thereof, is ingenuous and free, looking on whatſoever is within its proſpect with the moſt equal eye imaginable, and yet paſſing over nothing of Moment without a due inſpection of it, as by an indifferent view thereof thou wilt eaſily perceive. *Farewel.*

THE CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

THERE is a Rule of Christian Faith, or a Way whereby to come to the certain knowledge of Christs Doctrine, instituted by God. Three different Opinions among the Learned of the Roman *Religion, where that Way is to be found; or wherein the Rule of Faith (as 'tis called by Controvertists) doth consist.*

SECTION II.

The Ground of the first Opinion of the Romanists *(which places the Rule of Faith in the Definition of a General Council confirmed by the Pope) being this, That a General Council confirm'd by the Pope, cannot err in Matters of Religion, seriously consider'd of, and thought to be erroneous.*

SECT.

SECTION. III.

The Reason of the Second Opinion among the Romish *Party, (namely, That the Definition of a General Council conciliarly proceeding with, or without the Pope, is the Rule of Faith) held to be, That a General Council conciliarly acting is infallible in Catholick Points of Faith, being taken into consideration; and the double meaning it may have, first shewn, the truth of the Proposition in each sense is discuss'd, and in the one acknowledg'd, but in the other denied.*

SECTION. IV.

The Foundation whereon we find the third Opinion of the Romanists *(to wit, that Oral Tradition, or the Living Voice of the Present Church in every Age is the Rule of Faith) to be built,* viz. *That Tradition is in Articles of Faith perpetually the same in all Ages, well div'd into, and more largely (because of the present great* Vogue *it has with the Learned of the* Romish *Profession here in* England) *insisted on, than the*

Grounds of both the Two former Opinions are.

SECTION V.

The Controvertists of the Reformed Church, make Scripture the Rule of Faith. Two main different Opinions, notwithstanding in what sense it is so held to be. The former Assertion, viz. *That the Scripture is clear to every understanding illuminated by the Holy Ghost, in all those things which are necessary to Salvation, throughly inspected and esteem'd to be more plausible than sound. A Sect, that holds private inspiration of the Spirit of God, absolutely necessary, as well for knowing as understanding the Word of God. Another sort of People, who talk of a Light within them, to be their sole Guide in Matters of Belief and Practice. Both these Pretensions fairly discuss'd, and found to be Delusions.*

SECTION VI.

The other Assertion which some of the Reformed hold, viz. *That all things necessary to*

to Salvation, are clear in Scripture to every understanding, impartially reflected on, and Reasons given why 'tis thought to be rather popular and pleasing, than solid and satisfactory.

SECTION VII.

Whether the Rule of Faith affords infallible, or but moral certitude of Christs Doctrine. Whether we may not now in our days have as great certainty thereof, as the Disciples of the Apostles had. And whether the like certainty which they had be not enough for the Church of the present and future Ages.

SECTION VIII.

By what Means the knowledge of a Matter of Fact (such as the preaching of the Gospel by Christ and his Apostles was) may be perpetuated. An examen of the force of the Romanists *main Argument whereby they endeavour to shew, that Scripture cannot be the Rule of Faith. Whether the Scripture be not as intelligible in Points of*

of Faith, as Tradition or the Living Voice of the Church is.

SECTION IX.

What the Properties of the Rule of Faith be, and whether they agree to Holy Scripture.

SECTION X.

An Enquiry, Whether Christs Doctrine has been practically convey'd without intermission from the days of the Apostles, unto ours. And of what validity four grand Arguments urg'd against the indefectibility of Tradition, are.

SECTION XI.

What rational assurance we have, That Scripture is not corrupted in Necessaries to Salvation. The way to know what Things have been ever Orally taught. Two Reasons given, why Tradition, though it be of an indefectible Nature, should not be the Rule of Faith. Whether a Fundamental Error, can ever

ever obtain a ſetled quiet poſſeſſion in the Viſible Church? An offer from Reaſon for the impoſſibility of the thing. Errors not-Fundamental, may overſpread the Church, or, at leaſt, a great and conſiderable part of it, and why? Several Inſtances of ſuch Errors in the Roman *Church.*

SECTION XII.

That the Holy Scripture, or Written Word of God, is the Rule of Faith. That Tradition is a neceſſary means whereby to attain to the certain knowledge thereof. That the Multitude, or weakeſt ſort of Chriſtians, are not able of themſelves, without the help of others, to reſolve Faith aright, or be rationally aſſur'd, what the Doctrine of Salvation is.

SECTION XIII.

The harm that may ariſe to the Church from the belief of an Error not-Fundamental, to be an Article of Faith. The true ſtating of the difference between the Church of England, *and the Church of* Rome.

The

The Church of England *clear'd from the guilt of Schism, and the* Roman *justly blam'd for being Cause of the Separation. That the joynt Concurrence of Scripture and Oral Tradition, (or the practical Delivery of Christs Doctrine) was recommended by the Blessed Apostles to the Church; the Restauration of which Concurrence, ('tis humbly conceiv'd) would be a firm Foundation for re-uniting dissenting Christians in Matters of Religion; and the Continuance of it a lasting Means for perpetuating Christianity in it's Ancient native Purity.*

ERRATA.

PAge 35. Line 13. after *thereof*, insert (. p. 58. l. 16. for *ingenious*, r. *ingenuous*. p. 68. l. 8. after *such*, insert *as*. p. 70. l. 5. for *argument*, r. *arguing*. p. 82. l. 2. for *Article*, r. *Articles*. p. 130. l. 10. for *us*, r. *as*. p. 136. l. 7. for *not be*. r. *not to be*. p. 176. l. 25. after *discretion*, insert (. p. 189. l. 5. for *other*, r. *others*. The rest of the Errata's are some few very obvious literal mistakes and mispointings.

THE

THE SEVERAL WAYS Of Resolving FAITH Us'd by Controvertists in the *ROMAN* and *REFORMED* CHURCHES.

With the Authors Impartial thoughts of each of them;
And his own Opinion declared, wherein he conceives the *Rule* of *Faith* doth truly consist.

SECTION I.

There is a Rule of Faith instituted by God. Three different Opinions among the Learned of the Roman *Religion wherein it consists.*

SINCE it was the *Almighties* good pleasure to Create *Man*, it became his *Divine Wisdom* and *Goodness* not only to ordain an End convenient for his *Rational Nature*, with *Means* likewise

available to the attainment of the ſame; but alſo to conſtitute a *Way* by which he might come to the manifeſt *Knowledge* of both; for in vain would the *Two former* have been inſtituted without the *laſt*, when by *this* alone, both the *other* were to be made *known* unto him.

That therefore there is a *Way* ordain'd by God, whereby to underſtand aright Mans *Chief End*, and the proper *Means* available to it, remains without diſpute. Yet ſuch however is the Variance and Conteſt amongſt many men of very great Parts and Learning about it, that through their ſubtle Arguments, and eager Zeal to defend every one his eſpouſed Opinion, not a few ſober well-minded Chriſtians are brought into a Labyrinth of intricate Difficulties and Doubts *what* they ought to believe; while the *Controvertiſts* in Religion, though they all of them aſſert in general, that the *Doctrine revealed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles* is ſufficient for every mans Salvation, continue nevertheleſs at perpetual Diſcord and Diſpute what in particular the *Truths revealed* by them are; becauſe they'l come to no Agreement about

about the *Way* or *Means* which ſhould guide Men to the *Knowledge* of them; or in what the *Rule of Faith* (as Polemick Diſputants phraſe it) doth conſiſt.

Wherefore ſince the knowledge of *Chriſts Doctrine*, and of the *Chief end* of Man, together with the *Means* available to the obtaining of it, is one and the ſame thing; it's of that concern to be rationally aſſured, *which* is in very deed the *Right Rule of Faith*, that all poſſible endeavours would be abundantly recompenſed, by acquiring a well-grounded ſatisfaction therein. To which end the beſt Expedient I know of, will, I judge, be this, to take an equal and impartial view of the different Opinions about it, that by comparing them together, I may be enabled either to make a right choice of ſome *One* before the reſt; or elſe to gather from the whole Diſquiſition, that ſatisfaction is not to be expected without a *further* enquiry to be made *wherein* the *Rule of Faith* doth to a throughly unbyaſſed Judgment appear *rightly* to be placed.

The firſt difference worthy of notice

about the *Rule of Faith*, is concerning the *Nature* of the Assurance which it is to afford; some affirming that it ought to give *infallible* certainty, whilst others say that it need only yield a *moral* certitude, or such an Assurance as is sufficient to remove *actual doubting*, but not which renders it *impossible* to be deceived in *Matters of Faith*. Those that hold the *Rule of Faith* to be infallible *quoad nos*, in respect of us, are part of them of the *Roman*, and part of the *Reformed* Church. Those who maintain the *contrary*, are only some of the *Reformed*. As to the *Merit* of either Opinion, I'll leave the discussion of it to another place; and at present shew, *wherein* the *Romish* Controvertists, of which there are *Three* principal sorts, will have the *Rule of Faith* to consist.

The first sort maintain that *A General Council confirmed by the Pope* (or, as some chuse rather to say, *the Pope defining in a General Council*) *cannot err in matters of Faith*, and thereupon assert,

The Definition of a General Council, confirmed by the Pope, or, *The Defini-*

finition of the Pope in a General Council to be the Rule of Faith.

The Second sort affirm, that *A General Council conciliarly proceeding, is before its Confirmation by the Pope infallible in Points of Faith*; whence according to the Opinion of these men,

The Definition of a General Council, conciliarly proceeding is the Rule of Faith.

The Third sort assert, that *The Living Voice of the Church*, or, *Oral Tradition, is in Articles of Faith perpetually the same*; and so will have,

Oral Tradition, or, *The Living Voice of the Church in every Age of time, that which is the Rule of Faith.*

It will be here of use, for avoiding Confusion, and preventing mistake to observe, that *Oral Tradition* is held by the *Traditionists* to comprehend and deliver the *Whole Doctrine of Salvation*, preserv'd

in the *hearts* of the *Faithful* throughout all Ages from the first *Plantation* of *Christianity*, and is therefore maintained by them to be the *adequate* and *primary Rule of Christian Faith*, (without having any dependence on *Scripture*) which unless the *Pope* and *General Councils* closely adhere to, and follow in *Defining Points of Faith*, they are not (say the *Traditionists*) exempt from *Error* in framing their *Definitions*, and in case they deviate from it, actually err. But the *Definitions* of either *Popes*, or *Councils* are not held by the other two sorts of *Romish* Controvertists to be the *Primary Rule of Faith*. For the *One* of them asserting that the *Pope*, the *Other* that a *General Council* is infallible in declaring what Divine Truths are contained in the *Written word of God*, called *Holy Scripture*, and in the *Unwritten word of God*, styled *Apostolical Traditions*, both of them averr the *Divine Word* to be the *Primary Rule of Faith*; and the *Definitions* of *Popes* and *Councils* to be a Declarative Rule only, of *what* the *Primary Rule* contains, to the *Church*. And yet because such *Definitions* are esteem'd by them as

true

true and *certain* as the *Primary Rule*, and withal more *clearly* and *plainly* expreſſive of the *Mind* and *Will* of *God*, they judge it fit and uſeful to Reſolve *Faith* into *thoſe*, rather than into this, which they think the *Pope*, or a *General Council* alone able *Infallibly* to interpret and give the *true* ſenſe of. This I take to be the generally received ſentence of thoſe who reſolve *Faith* into *Definitions* of *Popes*, or *General Councils*. Yet there are amongſt them (of which number are *Stapleton*, *Relect. Controv.* 4, *Quæſt.* 2. and *Valentia*, *Tom.* 3. *Diſput.* 1.) whoſe Opinion is, that *Definitions* concerning *Points* of *Faith* are not *Concluſions* following from any *Means* uſed as from *Premiſſes* neceſſarily inferring, and evidencing the *ſame*, but the *Product* of the *Holy Spirits* extraordinary and immediate *Operation* and *Suggeſtion*, yet not till a due uſe of *Means* has firſt been made and performed.

SECTION II.

The First Opinion mentioned, of the Romanists, *that a* General Council confirmed by the Pope, is Infallible in Matters of Faith, *considered of, and found to be erroneous.*

TO Argue here, as some do, that a *General Council* hath either erred, or not erred before it be confirmed by the *Pope*; if it have erred, the Popes confirmation cannot make an Error become a Truth; if it have not erred, the Confirmation adds nothing to the Truth of the Definition: to argue, I say, thus, is fair enough, I confess, the Proposition thus worded, *a General Council Confirmed by the Pope cannot err*; but yet is not to me, I must needs own, convincing, in respect of the sense intended; for it is not meant, that the *Popes Confirmation makes the Definition of the Council to be Infallibly true*, but that it only *shews* it to be so, when there was no *infallible* assurance of its truth before. But then this being supposed to be their

their meaning whoſe the Propoſition is, let them change it, as in reaſon they ought, and expreſs it thus, *The Pope in Confirming a* General Council *cannot err*; and when 'tis ſo rendred, it will be eaſily found to be erroneous. For if the *Pope* may be an *Heretick*, he may *err*; in *matters* of *Faith*; and that he may be an *Heretick* is apparent from *Gratian* (whom *Bellarmin* atteſts, *Decreta & Canones tum ex Pontificum Epiſtolis & Conciliorum Definitionibus, tum ex Libris Sanctorum Patrum ſatis diligenter collegiſſe, lib. de Tranſlat. Imperii Rom. 1 Cap. 13. pag. 979. D.) diſtinct.* 40. Where 'tis ſaid, *Si Papa ſuæ & fraternæ ſalutis negligens deprehenditur, inutilis & remiſſus in operibus ſuis; & inſuper à bono taciturnus, quod magis officit ſibi & omnibus, nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim ſecum ducit, primo mancipio* Gehennæ *cum ipſo plagis multis in æternum vapulaturus, hujus culpas iſtic redarguere præſumit mortalium nullus, quia cunctos ipſe judicaturus à nemine eſt judicandus niſi deprehendatur à FIDE devius.* Yea and which is more, we have this following plain acknowledgment of the Popes great Cham-

Champion, *Non possumus non negare quin* Hadrianus *cum Concilio Romano, imo & tota Synodus Octava Generalis senserit in causa Hæresis Romanum Pontificem judicari posse, Bellarm. Tom. 1. l. 2. de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 30. Seeing then the Pope may *err* in *Faith*, and be an *Heretick*, what should hinder him, when an *Erroneous Council*, with which he accords in Opinion, requires his *Confirmation*, from confirming it? Not his *Judgment*, for that is supposed to be the same with the *Councils*. And if his *Judgment* do not hinder him, much less can his *Will* in opposition to his *Judgment* be thought to do it; for otherwise his *Holiness* should refuse to do an Act, which his *Judgment* told him ought to be done for the *Benefit* of the whole *Church*, forasmuch as the *Point* defined by the *Council* is held both by himself and them to be an *Article* of *Faith*. If it be replyed (as Cardinal *Bellarm.* indeed doth *lib.* 4. *de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 3.) that albeit the Pope as a particular *Doctor* should embrace an *Heretical Tenet*, yet he could not as *Pastor* of the *Universal Church* propound it to be believed by *Christians*, (as he would do in

con-

confirming the erroneous Definition of a *General Council*) leſt otherwiſe the *Flock* of *Chriſt* ſhould univerſally be led *aſtray*: My Anſwer is, that God no doubt, would work *Miracles*, and make a *corrupt tree bring forth good fruit*, and cauſe an *Heretick* to preach *Truths* directly oppoſite to his own *Thoughts*, rather than the *Gates of Hell ſhould prevail againſt his Church.* But what, I pray, neceſſity has the *Almighty* to take ſuch ſtrange unnatural courſes to preſerve the Church by? Muſt all men unavoidably err, if one principal perſon do? Or is there no other poſſible Way to be confirmed in the knowledge of all neceſſary Divine Truths, but from the Popes *Confirmation* of a *General Council*? Had the *Catholick Church* indeed no *certainty* of the truth of *Chriſts Divinity* till the firſt *Nicene* Council was approved on by the Biſhop of *Rome*? Or was ſhe without a full aſſurance that the *Holy Ghoſt* was God co-eſſential with the *Father* and the *Son* till the *Popes confirmation* of the Second *General Council* held at *Conſtantinople*? Or did the Belief of two *Natures* in *Chriſt*, *Divine* and *Humane*, derive its

Origin

Origin from the date of his *Holineſs* his *Approbation* of the *General Council* of *Chalcedon*? The *Catholick Church*, 'tis agreed on all hands, can never *err* in *Fundamental Verities*, but does her *Inerrability* for certain depend upon *one* (though prime) Biſhop's *Infallibility* in *propounding* them? Nothing leſs, the contrary being ſo evidently clear, that it is an *Article of Faith* to believe the *Inerrability* of the *Catholick Church* in *Fundamentals*; ſince to believe *One holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church* (which is an *Article* of our *Creed*) is to believe that there is perpetually *A Society of Chriſtians, who hold and profeſs One holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith in all the world*; the Definition of the *Catholick Church* neceſſarily containing this, that it is *A Society of Chriſtian People united in the Belief and Profeſſion of One holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith, every where the ſame.* But it is ſo far from being an *Article of Faith*, that the *Pope* as *Pope*, *cannot teach Hereſie*; or that when he *teaches the whole Church, he cannot err in things pertaining to Faith*, as that *Bellarmin* himſelf, though he ſaies it is an Opinion the moſt certain

of

of three mentioned by him, *lib.* 4. *de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 2. held by Catholicks differing each from other, yet he owns there that the *oppoſite Doctrine* (*viz.* that the *Pope* as *Pope may teach Hereſie*) is not *heretical*, becauſe it is tolerated by the *Church*. This alone is enough to evince, that the *Inerrability* of the *Church* in *Matters* of *Faith*, depends not on the *Infallibility* of the *Popes* propounding them, becauſe it is both *heretical* and a *contradiction*, *in adjecto* (as was ſhewn above) to affirm that the *Catholick Church* can *err* in *Points* of *Faith*; but 'tis neither, to aſſert that the *Pope* as *Pope* can *teach Hereſie*. Yea the *Cardinal* in the place laſt quoted out of him, directs to ſeveral learned Writers of their Church, *Nilus*, *Gerſon*, *Almain*, *Alphonſus de Caſtro* and Pope *Adrian* 6. who all of them, he ſaith, averr, that the *Pope* as *Pope* may be an *Heretick* and *teach Hereſie*; and that it actually hath fallen out that he did; after which he concludes, ſpeaking of thoſe Authors, thus, *Qui omnes non in Pontifice, ſed in Eccleſia ſive in Concilio Generali tantùm, conſtituunt Infallibilitatem judicii de rebus Fidei.*

Fidei. Nor is the Tenet of the Popes *Infallibility* in *Defining Points of Faith* barely accused by several learned *Romanists* of *Errour*; but it is even exclaimed against by some of them as an Opinion of most *dangerous* and *pernicious consequence*, because if it should come to be *universally* believ'd, it might prove the *Ruine* of the *Church*; for since the Pope may be an *Heretick*; in case he should at any time really become one, so many *Christians*, as verily thought him to be *infallible* in *things of Faith*, would upon certain notice had of his Opinion, and of his Endeavour to propagate it, (which, considering the natural desire men have to wish their own Sentiments, especially when esteem'd of necessary use, to be embraced by others, he would be prone to do) turn *Hereticks* together with him; and if so be all Christians should think the like of him, all would do the same, and then farewell *Church*; for by the holding of any one Error destructive of a *Fundamental Truth*, or *Article of Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, the *Church* would lose an essential part of its *Being*, and cease to be the *Spouse of Christ*.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Second Opinion of the Romaniſts, viz. that, *A General Council conciliarly proceeding, is before its Confirmation by the Pope Infallible in Matters of Faith, being taken into Conſideration, and the double meaning which the words* Conciliarly proceeding *are capable of, explain'd, the Truth of the Propoſition in each ſenſe is diſcuſs'd, and in the One acknowledged, in the Other denied.*

THE Aſſertion of the *Second* ſort of *Romiſh Controvertiſts*, that a *General Council Conciliarly proceeding cannot err in Matters of Faith*, may be underſtood (as it is rendred at large) in a twofold ſenſe; for if the words *conciliarly proceeding* include (as they well may) an *infallible Rule* which all Councils ought ſtrictly to follow, the Meaning of the Propoſition is, that a *General Council proceeding by an Infallible Rule, not deviated from, cannot err*; and ſo taken, it is an evidently certain truth. But if by *Conciliarly proceeding* be intended

intended only, that the *Prelats* enjoy their due *Freedom* without *Fraud* or *Fear* to pervert their *Actings*, then the Proposition must intimate this, that a *General Council* left to its own *just liberty cannot err in framing Definitions of Faith*; in which sense the Assertion will admit of debate, whether it be true or no. For if it be not certain, that every *Free General Council* closely still adheres to an *Infallible Rule* in all its *Definitions* about *Faith*, there can be no *certainty*, but that a *Free General Council* may *err* in *defining Points* of *Faith*; because in case the *Bishops* rely upon any other Ground (as for example, on their *skill* of Interpreting *Holy Writ* over and above the understanding of plain Texts of *Scripture*, and of making *necessary* and *clear deductions* from them; or on their *profound knowledge* in *Theologie* and *School-divinity*) in making their *definitions*, we have no good Assurance that they cannot *err*; and declare something to be an *Article* of *Faith*, which is not so. For since the several mentioned *Abilities* (however commendable in their kind) come short of being *Infallible*; that which has no more

more certainty for its truth, than what depends upon *them*, cannot in Reason be held to be of *infallible verity*. If reply be made, that *Christ* has promised to be with his *Church* to the end of the World, and that albeit the *Fathers* met in *Council* make use of *Humane Aids* and *Means* in their search after *Divine Truths*; yet they do not so rely thereon, as to think their *Definitions* simply to depend upon *humane endeavours* and *performances*, but on the *promised assistance* of *Christs Spirit* in guiding, in the due use of the *means* in themselves *fallible*, to the Truth *infallibly*. My return is, that admitting *Christs* promised presence by his Spirit to the *Church*, extends to the *Church Representative* (which is a lawful *Gen. Council*) so as *infallibly* to guide it in the due use of *means* to all necessary *Truths*; yet unless the Bishops *certainly* know, *when* they have throughly made due use of *means*, and wholly performed whatever is requisite on their parts for the discovery of the Truth they are in search of, they can neither be *sufficiently* assured *themselves*, nor *rationally* assure others that their *definitions*

are *infallibly* true. And *whence* they can *certainly* know, that they have throughly made due use of *means*, and wholly perform'd whatever is requisite on their parts for the discovery of the *Truth*, they are in search of, unless the *means* made use of *evidently* shew the *Truth* sought after, (which it is here supposed they do not, *fallible means*, whereof the Speech now is, being never able to give *infallible notice* of the *Truth* by affording a clear *evidence* of the same) whensoever we shall be made acquainted therewith, an Obligation will lye upon us to own it as a great and rare discovery, if manifested to our Reason to be true. But till then, it will be Prudence (in my thoughts) to acquiesce in the old fashion'd doctrine, that such as the *Premisses* are, such will be the *Conclusion*; if the *Premisses* be only *probable*, the *Conclusion* will be no more; if the *Premisses* be necessary, the *Conclusion* will be no less; if the *Premisses* be *infallible*, the *Conclusion* will be the like; so that in fine, to me it appears altogether reasonable, that those men who expect an Assent to the *Definitions* of *Popes* or *Councils*, as

to

to *infallible truths*, ſhould firſt demonſtrate, that they are evidently grounded on an *infallible bottom*. This, I find, the *Traditionary Diſputants* think no more than equitable and fitting to be done; and for that cauſe make proffer of directing us to a plain and eaſie *Rule* of an *infallible* nature, by which we may be fully and clearly aſſured that the *whole Doctrine* of *Faith* profeſſed by the *Church* of *Rome* is *infallibly* true. Of which great proffer what good performance they make, an impartial enquiry ſhall hereafter next enſue.

SECT. IV.

The Third Opinion of the Romiſh *party, that,* The living Voice of the Church, *or* Oral Tradition *is in Articles of Catholick and Apoſtolick Faith, perpetually the ſame in all Ages, more largely handled than the two former (becauſe now moſt in vogue with the Learned of that Profeſſion here in* England) *and impartially weigh'd and conſidered of.*

THE *third* sort of the *Romish polemick Disputants*, finding (I imagine) that the *two former* fell short of giving satisfaction to many sober judicious persons, took upon them to *demonstrate*, That the *Doctrine of the present* Roman Church, *is the same in Matters of Faith, which Christ and his Apostles taught*; so that these likewise, as well as the other, attribute *infallibility* to their *Church*, yet not depending on an *immediate influence* from *Heaven*, but on a *series* of *Causes* setled by the good *Providence* of *God*, which in their own *nature* are such, as can never fail to transmit the *Doctrine* of *Salvation* both *pure* and *entire* from generation to generation while the World lasts.

The *Causes* which effect this, they say is *Oral Tradition*, or the *living voice of the Church*, which they affirm to be always the *same* in every different *Age* of the world; so that not only *whatsoever* was deliver'd to the Primitive Christians by *Christ* and his *Apostles* as a *Point* of *Faith*, hath been perpetually handed down from time to time, without interruption till

our

our days, as *such*, and will be to the worlds end; but also that nothing under the notion of an *Article* of *Faith* can ever be receiv'd and entertain'd by the *Church*, which is not *really* and *truly* so.

The *former* of these Assertions they labour to prove from the *indefectible* nature of *Tradition*; the *latter* from this *Maxim* held (as they say) in the *present* Church of *Rome*, that *the Christian Faith was deliver'd to her as descending without interruption from Christ and his Apostles*; which *Maxim* they tell us, their *Church* must needs in every Age have had: Forasmuch as if any of its Members in any one Age had gone about to take it up, and tell their Posterity, That the Faith they deliver'd to them, was receiv'd by themselves from their Ancestors and Predecessors, as un-interruptedly descending from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when it was not so; the Attempt of such a plain and impious *Imposture* would have had no power to deprave the whole *Church*, since it cannot be conceiv'd, that vast multitudes of people, especially Christian, could possibly be drawn to conspire together in

so notorious and base a Falshood, as that would have plainly been.

To the *former* Assertion, (*viz. That whatsoever was deliver'd to the Primitive Christians by Christ and his Apostles, as a Point of Faith, hath been perpetually handed down from time to time without interruption till our days, as such,*) and it's assign'd proof, the *indefectibility* of *Tradition*, I shall say nothing here, but remit the discourse, I intend upon them, to another place; and at present enquire, Whether the *present* Church of *Rome* does indeed depend on this *Maxim*, for the *certainty* of the *purity* of her *Faith*, That *Christs Doctrine was deliver'd to her, as descending without interruption from Christ and his Apostles*? For if it appear, upon trial made, *she* doth not; then however indefectible *Tradition* be, it may notwithstanding fall out, that *new Articles* of *Faith* may be introduced into the *Church* upon some other Ground, not *firm* and *safe*; such as the *Traditionists* will, I know, grant, That the *Definition* of a *General Council*, not founded on *Oral Tradition*, but on this *Presumption*, That the *Bishops* effectually pro-

proceeding to *define*, are *immediately* inſpir'd from *Heaven*, is. And that the *Roman Church* does not rely on the mentioned *Maxim* for the certainty of the *purity* and *uncorruptedneſs* of her *Faith*, I have ſomething which ſeems conſiderable, and of moment, to alledge in proof.

It will not, I preſume be deny'd, That Cardinal *Bellarmin*, and the learned *Romiſh Controvertiſts*, more generally taken notice of after him, ever ſince the *Reformation*, till *Ruſhworths Dialogues* came to light, (for all that they made it their buſineſs to *reſolve Faith*, according to the *belief* and *practice* of their *Church*) did not conclude and averr *Tradition* to be the *alone* ſafe *Means* of conveying *Chriſts Doctrine* to the knowledge of ſucceeding Ages. And if ſuch great Lights among the *Roman Clergy*, miſtook the *Rule of Faith*, how can we reaſonably think, that the inferior Paſtors and Laicks in their time, knew it aright? And if they knew it not, neither could they rely on it as *ſuch*. For although it were granted (which ſome ſay) that *Bellarmin* himſelf, and all the learned *Clerks* of the *Roman Church*, no

less than the other *Clergy* and *Lay-men*, did *practically* rely on *Tradition*, in as much as they were *Orally* taught their *Religion* by the *preceeding* Generation; and that again by the next before it, and so still backwards, *one* Age of *another*, ever since the very first beginning of *Christianity*; yet unless they also *knowingly* did it, when once they came to make enquiry upon what *stedfast Ground* the *Christian faith* was to be embrac'd, they would no longer rest upon the *instruction* they had when they *first* in their younger years believ'd, if so be upon search made, they conceiv'd (as it seems the chiefest of them, besides many more, if not the generality, did) that the *certainty* of *faith* was not founded on *Oral Tradition*, their first *Instructor* in it, but on something else. Yea, I think, I shall not mistake the truth, if, I say, that it was not the *private* opinion of some great *Doctors*, and their *followers* only; but the sense of the *Council* of *Trent* it self also; That *faith* is not resolved into *Oral Tradition* as it's *adequate Rule*; whilst in consulting the first *Decree* of the fourth *Session* of that *Council*, I find two *Passages*, which

which seem to make it out: The *former* of them is this, *Sacrosancta, Oecumenica, & Generalis Tridentina Synodus, &c. perspiciens hanc* (nempe Christianam) *veritatem & disciplinam, contineri in Libris scriptis, & sine Scripto Traditionibus, quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt, Orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes Libros tam veteris quàm novi Testamenti cùm utriusque Deus sit Author, necnon Traditiones ipsas tum ad fidem, tum ad Mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus à Christo, vel à Spiritu Sancto dictatas, & continuâ successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentiâ suscipit, ac veneratur,* The *latter* Passage closeth up the *Decree* thus; *Si quis Libros ipsos integros* (Scripturæ scilicet) *cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, & in veteri vulgata Latina Editione habentur, pro Sacris & Canonicis non susceperit, & Traditiones praedictas sciens & prudens contempserit, anathema sit. Omnes itaque intelligant quo ordine, & viâ ipsa Synodus, post jactum fidei*

fidei fundamentum sit progressura, & quibus potissimùm Testimoniis, ac Præsidiis in confirmandis Dogmatibus, & instaurandis in Ecclesia Moribus sit usura. In both these Passages, *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions* are plainly contradistinguish'd, as *equally* relating some way or other to *Christian Faith* and *Manners*. And although in the *former* place, they seem to be *principally* oppos'd, as the *Written*, and *Unwritten Word* of *God*; yet not without this apparent intimation also, that as the *Books*, or *Written Words* call'd *Scripture*, lead to the *sense* or *Doctrine* contain'd in them; so likewise the *Unwritten Words* wherein *Apostolical Traditions* are taught, guide to the *meaning* couch'd in them: so that as *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions* taken in the *former* sense, are held by the *Council* to be *equally* the *Word* of *God*; so are they moreover in the *latter* sense held to be *equally* significative and expressive of the *Doctrine* of *Salvation* delivered by them. But in the *latter* rehearsed place of the *Decree*, *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions* are *chiefly* to be understood of *written* and *unwritten words* di-

directing to the knowledge of the *Objects* of *Faith*; as appears by these Lines here following transcrib'd from thence: *Quibus potissimùm Testimoniis, & Præsidiis* (nempe Scripturâ & Traditionibus) *in confirmandis Dogmatibus, & instaurandis in Ecclesia Moribus, sit usura Synodus.* For *Scripture* and *Traditions*, cannot here be taken for *Christs Doctrine* it self, but for *Characters* and *Sounds*, apt to discover what is *meant* by them. From the whole, therefore I gather, That the *Council* of *Trent*, resolves *Faith* into *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions*, when taken for the *Word* of *God*, or *Doctrine* of *Salvation*, as into it's *proper Object*; and into the same *Scripture* and *Traditions*, when taken, the *one* for a *Testimony* in *Writing*, the *other* for an *Oral Testimony*, as into it's *adequate Rule*; saving what the Adverb *potissimùm*, in the last recited Passage of the *Council* may peradventure abate.

In hopes to enervate the force of this Discourse, 'twill not improbably, be said, That *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions*, are granted to be held by the *Tridentin Council*, the *Totum* or *Extent* of all *reveal'd Truths*;

Truths; and conſequently the *Characters* and *Sounds*, or the *written* and *unwritten* words, wherein they are contain'd, the *material Rule* of *Faith*; but ſeeing it is *Oral Tradition* that informs us of the *ſenſe* of *both*, this *alone* is the *formal Rule* of *Faith*, and that even according to the mind of the *Trent Fathers* themſelves; as the ſubſequent paſſage of the ſecond *Decree* of the fourth *Seſſion*, teſtifieth; *Ad coercenda petulantia ingenia decernit* (eadem ſcilicet Sacroſancta Synodus) *ut nemo ſuæ prudentiæ innixus in rebus Fidei, & Morum ad ædificationem Doctrinæ Chriſtianæ pertinentium, ſacram Scripturam, ad ſuos ſenſus contorquens, contra eum ſenſum quem tenuit ac tenet Sancta Mater Eccleſia, cujus eſt judicare de vero ſenſu & interpretatione Scripturarum ſanctarum, aut etiam contra ſenſum unanimem Patrum ipſam Scripturam ſacram interpretari audeat.*

In return to this, I ſhall not deny, but that if *Holy Scripture* were Writ, and *Apoſtolical Traditions* expreſs'd in Words, not plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*, but had their *intelligibleneſs* in *Matters* of *Faith* and *Manners* from *Oral Tradition*,

dition, or the *Living Voice* of the *Church* in every Age, this *alone* would be the *formal Rule* of *Faith*. But then, in case the thing were truly so, and the late quoted place of the *Council* intended as much; I see not how that learned *Assembly* can be clear'd from contradicting it self; since *Scripture*, and *Apostolical Traditions*, if meer *unintelligible* Characters and Sounds, without their suppos'd authentick Interpreter *Oral Tradition*, would be so far from being *two Witnesses*, or *Testimonies* of *Christs Doctrine*, (which yet, as was seen, the *Council* solemnly, and not transiently, calls them) that they would neither of them be any *Witness* or *Testimony* thereof at all; the very *nature* and *office* of a *Witness* or *Testimony* being this, to *manifest*, and render *intelligible* to those who are *immediately* concern'd to understand it, what it bears *witness* or gives *testimony* unto; *immediately*, I say, concern'd; but *who* those are, in respect of the *Rule* of *Christian Faith*, I deferr the enquiry of to another place. At present, in regard it will not, I presume, be admitted that the *Council* contradicts it self,

the

the sence of the rehearsed Passage is far more obvious, than that which hath been mention'd, (if not evident) to be this, That whensoever the *Holy Scripture* is through either weakness, or wilfulness drawn to a *wrong sense*, it of *Right* belongs to the *Governours* of the *Church* to declare the *true sence* thereof; which the *Council* might very well think to be just and fitting without supposing the *words* of *Scripture* to be *unsens'd Characters*, since experience dayly shews, that things *easie* to be understood, are often mistaken by the *vulgar*, and *very plain* words and sentences wrested by men of *subtle wits*, to a *perverse sense*.

Two Witnesses then of *Christs Doctrine*, viz. *Scripture* and *Apostolical Traditions*, the *Council* of *Trent* still seems to me plainly to assert. But besides these, let's consider if there was not moreover a *third*, which the *Prelats* had an eye to, in respect of something *defined* by them; for I cannot conjecture, what they should mean by the Word *potissimum*, mentioned before, except this, That there are some *divine Truths*, which are not so clearly con-

contain'd either in *Scripture*, or *Apoſtolical Traditions*, as to be ſufficiently atteſted by them; and that therefore, they ſtood need of a *further Teſtimony*, to make them *manifeſt*; which whether it was the *unanimous* conſent of the *Fathers*, or the *immediate aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Spirit*, or ſomething elſe which the *Council* intended, I have no need to be ſcrupulous about, ſince my buſineſs in this place, was no more but to diſcover, Whether the *Church* of *Rome* (as 'tis affirm'd by the *Traditioniſts*) do really rely on this *Maxim* for her *Faith*, that it was recommended to her as *Orally deſcending by a continued ſucceſſion, from Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; or that it is but a thing ſpeciouſly pretended, on her behalf, to avouch her *Doctrine* by; wherein, as the preceeding Diſcourſe hath already ſhewn in general, ſo the ſubſequent will hereafter ſhew in particular, what the truth to my apprehenſion is; whilſt that which has been ſaid, concerning the *Council* of *Trent*'s opinion in the Point, ſhall be further ſeconded and confirm'd by ſeveral *Inſtances* out of the *ſame*.

The

The *first* shall be, That it has defin'd *Sess.* 4. *Decree* 1. what Books are *Canonical Scripture*, and *anathematizes* those who will not receive them as *such*, amongst which the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* is one; and yet it has not *always* been esteem'd *Canonical* by the *Western Church*, as is granted by *Cardinal Perron*, and others of the *Romish* Profession, that St. *Jerom*, whose testimony cannot be in reason refus'd, affirms; for being in his time an *eminent* Member of the *same Church*, he could not be ignorant of her *practice*; and that he would write an *untruth*, whereof he might easily be detected, is not at all credible.

The *Second* Instance is, That the *Books Apocryphal*, for which there is no *Universal Tradition*, that they are the *Word* of *God*, as Dr. *Cosins* (late Lord Bishop of *Durham*) in his *Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture* shews, are defin'd by the *Council* of *Trent*, *Sess.* 4. *Decree* 1. to be *Canonical Scripture*.

The *third* (and last Instance, which at present I shall produce) is to be seen, *Sess.* 7. *Can.* 9. *of the Trent Synod*, where we find

find it thus defining; *Si quis dixerit in tribus Sacramentis Baptiſmo ſcil. Confirmatione, & Ordine, non imprimi Characterem in anima, hoc eſt ſignum quoddam ſpirituale & indelebile, unde ea iterari non poſſunt, Anathema ſit.* Theſe according to the *Traditioniſts* are the *words*, or at leaſt, the *ſenſe* of the words of the *Church diffuſive* pronounc'd by it's *Repreſentative*; by which it ſeems there is a *Tradition*, that a *Character* or a *certain Spiritual indeleble ſign is imprinted in the Souls* of thoſe who are *baptiz'd*, *confirm'd* and *ordain'd*. Now That the generality of *Paſtors*, *Parents*, *Tutors*, and *Nurſes* (the ſure *Conveyers* of *Chriſtianity*, as the *Traditioniſts* tell us from *Age* to *Age*) ſhould know what it is to have a *Character* or *ſpiritual ſign imprinted in the Soul* (and without that they could not declare it in *various forms* of ſpeech, as was requiſite they ſhould, in regard, that one main reaſon given by the *Traditioniſts*, why *Chriſts Doctrine* cannot fail in the conveyance, is, becauſe it is expreſs'd ſo many *ſeveral* ways, that the *generality* of the Hearers, cannot chuſe but underſtand

it *aright*) I see small cause to think, especially, when I reflect, That the great *Master* of the *Traditionary Disciples* in his *Institut. Sacr. Tom.* 2. *Lect.* 4. thus teacheth; *Ponere signa spiritualia*, i. e. *invisibilia contra ipsam rationem signi est, quod pro materiali oportet esse notum & visibile, pro eo verò quod significat latens, unde non nisi inter homines, qui colligunt scientiam ex objectis, reperiuntur, & non possunt esse spiritualia, sed ex necessitate sensibilia.* And in the page following, the same learned *Author* asserteth; *Ipsam personam esse subjectum Characteris, cùm actio sit communis corpori, & animæ*, i. e. *totius.* If perchance it should be said, that the scope of the *Canon* is only to declare, that there is an *appropriation*, or appointment of a mans whole life, to some solemn *Engagement* or *Action*; as by *Baptism* to be a *Christian*; by *Confirmation* to undergo couragiously the *Christian warfare*; by *Order* to Preach the *Word*, to administer the *Sacraments*, *&c.* so that not any of them is to be *iterated*; and this *Christians* generally know; for who is ignorant, that none us'd to be *Baptiz'd*, none *confirm'd*, none

ordain'd, more than once? I reply, if the *Tradition* of the *Church* be plac'd wholly in that; then in caſe the *Council* has defin'd *more*, it could not ground the ſame upon the *uninterrupted delivery* thereof. And that the *Council* has defin'd *more*, appears from this, That the *Canon* further declares *two* things, which whoſoever denies, incurrs an *Anathema*; the *one* is, That the *Character* given in the three nominated *Sacraments*, is a *ſpiritual ſign*; the *other*, That the *ſoul* (*alone*) is the *ſubject thereof*, for although the word *alone* be not in the *Canon*; yet it is neceſſarily imply'd, becauſe a *ſpiritual* ſign cannot be *imprinted* in a *corporeal* ſubſtance) and therefore, as to theſe, the *Council* could not ground the *Definition* upon *Tradition*.

SECTION V.

The Controvertists of the Reformed Church, *make* Scripture *the* Rule *of* Faith. *Two main different Opinions, notwithstanding in what sense it is so. The former Assertion look'd into, and thought more plausible, than solid. A Sect which holds private illumination of the spirit a necessary Means of knowing and understanding Scripture. Another sort of people, who take the Light within them, to be their sole Guide in matters of Belief and Practice. Both their Pretensions fairly examined, and found to be delusions.*

HAving given some principal reasons, why I cannot approve of the *Romish ways* of *resolving Faith*, I'le proceed to enquire into the Assertions of the more popularly applauded *Disputants* of the *Reformed Church* concerning it, and try what rational satisfaction can be expected from them. I'le nominate them both (for they are two) in this place, but shall referr

ferr the conſideration of the *latter* to the following *Section*; and treat here at preſent of the *former* only, which is this;

The Sacred Scripture is clear in all things neceſſary to Salvation, to as many as have their Underſtandings illuminated by the holy Spirit.

The *other* Aſſertion (which ſhall be handled afterwards) is rendred thus;

All things neceſſary to Salvation, are clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding.

According to both theſe,

The *Holy Scripture* (but in a different way) is *The Rule of Faith.*

Thoſe *Controvertiſts* who maintain the *former* Aſſertion, admit and make uſe of *Hiſtorical Tradition*, to guide them to the *Scripture*; which when they have found, they believe it to be the *Word* of *God*, no longer upon the account of *Tradition*, but for it's *own* cauſe. For theſe men, no leſs

than the *Romaniſts*, requiring *infallible* certainty of *Faith*, and thinking withal that no proof is *infallible* which is not *divine*, ſay that *Scripture*, by it's *own light*, diſcovers it ſelf to be the *Word* of God to every Underſtanding *capable* of diſcerning it, or which is *illuminated* (for that is their meaning) by the *Holy Ghoſt*. And to illuſtrate this, they compare the *Scripture* to the *Sun*; the *Underſtanding* to the *Eye*; ſaying, that although the *Sun* be a *glorious light*, ſufficiently able to manifeſt it's *own luſtre*, yet if the *Organ* of *ſeeing* be ſo out of frame that it cannot receive it's *rayes*, till the *eyeſight* be clear'd, the *glory* of the *Sun* will not be diſcern'd. In like manner albeit the *Scripture* has *light* enough in it ſelf to ſhew that it is of *Divine Authority*; yet if the *Intellect* be not in a fit diſpoſition to perceive the radiant *brightneſs* thereof (which it cannot by *nature*, but by a *Supernatural* aſſiſtance only be) it will remain devoid of being *enlightned thereby*.

All this, upon firſt ſight, is very plauſible and taking; but if the Compariſon be well obſerv'd, it comes not home to the

the buſineſs. For the *Eye* being naturally capable of receiving the *Sunbeams*, no more is requir'd to make it ſee the *Sun*, than the bare removal of ſuch *Obſtructions* or *infirmities* (if any be) as are contracted in, or about it, and the holding it open toward the *Sun*. But if the *Holy Spirit* do no more, but free the *Underſtanding* from ſuch *prejudices*, *obſcurities* and other *incumbrances* as impede the uſe of *Right Reaſon*, the *Scripture* will never diſcover it ſelf to the *Intellect* by the ſole peruſal of it to be of *divine Revelation*; no not ſo much as to the moſt *excellent* Sayings, and Sentences in it. For *ſuch* Sayings, and Sentences are either agreeable to *clear unbyaſs'd Reaſon*, and when read or heard, diſcernable by it to be *true*; or they are not; if they are, whatever their *excellency* appear to be, 'twill not neceſſarily ſhew them to be any part of *divine Revelation*, ſince they may be the *Efforts* of a *rational ſoul* as well as the *immediate Dictate* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or other *divine Revelation*, from the *Father* or the *Son*; if they are not, they'l be above the reach of *humane nature* to comprehend;

ſo that no man living ſhall with *certainty* be able to affirm they are of *God*, unleſs ſo aſcertain'd to him by ſome *Teſtimony* falling within the compaſs of his *Underſtanding*, plainly ſhewing them to be *divine Truths*.

If with intent to avoid the force of this reaſoning, or for any other cauſe and conſideration, ſome perchance ſhould ſay, That more is meant by *illumination* of the *Spirit*, than a bare clearing of the *Intellect* from ſuch *incumbrances* as hinder it's *due* apprehenſion of a thing otherwiſe *obvious* to it; they muſt relinquiſh, and diſclaim the Compariſon, between the *Sun* and the *Scripture*, the *Eye*, and the *Underſtanding*. Neither, when this is done, do I think they can intelligibly ſhew, *what* it is beſides. For if they'l have it to be ſome *celeſtial inſpiration*, which diſcovers the *light* of the *Scripture* to the *Intellect*, by imprinting a *ſupernatural Quality* in the *ſoul*, it muſt be ſuppos'd, that the *Scripture*, without this, is not a *light ſufficient* to manifeſt it ſelf, and then, the *Scripture* and the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* muſt either give *mutual* witneſs to each other,

other, while the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* ſhews the *Scripture* to be a *celeſtial light*; and the *Scripture* again, proves the *Illumination* of the *Spirit* to be a *divine Influence*, and no *deluſion*, (which every young Scholar knows to be a fallacious way of arguing;) or elſe, the diſcovery of the *Scriptures light*, muſt be held wholly to depend upon the *Illumination* of the *Spirit*, without attributing any help to *Scripture*, for the manifeſtation of it's own *light*, or that it is the *Word* of *God*; which is againſt the *ſuppoſition*, and likewiſe plain *Enthuſiaſm*.

Now that I am naming *Enthuſiaſm*, 'twill not be unſeaſonable to conſider by the way, what the *Enthuſiaſts*, whom I'le comprehend under *two* heads, hold, and what truth there is in their *opinions*.

The *one* ſort acknowledges (at leaſt in words) the *Holy Scripture* to be the *Rule of Faith*, but withal ſays, that no man can either know it to be *divinely inſpir'd*, or what the *true* ſenſe of it is, but by the *immediate operation* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which therefore whoſo hath not, he is void of *Grace*, and can never, ſo remaining, attain *Salvation*. That

That no *Christian* can be *sav'd* without the *Gifts* and Graces of the *Spirit*, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, is not to be doubted of. But that the *extraordinary* Gift of discerning the *Scripture* to be the *Word* of *God*, and of interpreting it *aright*, is necessary to *every* mans *salvation*, I see not any ground for. 'Tis true we read in *Holy Writ*, that in the *Apostles* days some had the *Gift* of interpreting *Scripture*, but it was not common to *all good Christians*, and therefore *others* who had it not, might be *saved*, if their Hearts were sanctified by *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*; which if those who were endued with the *Gift* of interpreting *Scripture* were *destitute* of, they might, yea certainly would fall short of *Bliss*, as is clear from these words of St. *Paul*, *Though I have the gift of Prophecy and understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge*, &c. *and have not Charity, I am nothing*, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. No Argument then can be drawn from those *inspired* men to justifie the *Tenet* of the *Enthusiasts* I am speaking of; because these make the *Gift* of interpreting *Scripture* to be necessary to *Salvation*, whereas it was in those

thoſe only *Gratia gratis data*, not *Gratia gratum faciens*, as was alſo the *Gift* of *Healing* and of *Tongues* in ſome others, but long ſince ceaſed, as not being of *neceſſary* uſe to the *Church* beyond that Age wherein *God* in his *Wiſdom* beſtow'd them on it.

The *other* ſort of *Enthuſiaſts* go further, for they have no regard to *Sacred Writ* as neceſſary for *direction*, *help*, or *aſſiſtance* either in their *belief* or *way* of *living*, but ſolely and wholly attend to the *Light* (as they call't) within them for their *guidance* in *both*, whilſt they think themſelves as *inerrably* inſtructed by *it*, as *Moſes*, the *Prophets*, and *Apoſtles* were by *God*.

That it is a *Deluſion* theſe people are poſſeſs'd with, this *Obſervation*, as to the Reſemblance of their *conceited* Light to that *true* one wherewith *Moſes* and the *Apoſtles* were *enlightned*, ſatisfies me; namely, that *theſe* confirm'd their *Doctrine* by many ſignal *Miracles*, as was altogether requiſite and even *neceſſary* they ſhould, becauſe the *one* (to wit *Moſes*) introduc'd a *Law* which *Humane wit* was not able to diſcern the *Good* of, in order

to

to *Salvation*: the *other* (viz. the *Apoſtles*) publiſh'd a *Doctrine* beyond *Mans Reaſon* to comprehend, or to ſee a *neceſſity* of, in reſpect of his *eternal welfare*; and therefore there had been no cauſe why the People ſhould have credited them, yea, they ought in reaſon to have deſpis'd them as *Impoſtors*, if they had not both told them that they had *Authority* for what they did *immediately* from *God*, and likewiſe had prov'd the ſame by *immediate Teſtimony* (as they did) from *Heaven*. But the *Enthuſiaſts*, here diſcours'd of, do no *Miracle*, and therefore ſeeing they labour to ſet up a *new Guide* in the world, *independent* on the *Word of God*, for the governing men in the whole courſe of their lives, as well for *Doctrine*, as *Practice*, they ought not in reaſon to have any *credit* given them, for as much as *That* (whatever it be) which has not the maniſeſt *ſtamp* of *Divine Authority* upon it, cannot without *injuſtice* exclude a *formerly* eſtabliſh'd *Divine Law*, and be plac'd *it ſelf* in ſtead thereof. This was one principal cauſe, why our *bleſſed Saviour*, being about to *abrogate* the *Law* of *Moſes*,

and

and to *introduce his own* in it's room, did many great *Miracles*, to evidence that *he* was ſent of *God*, as appears by theſe his own *ſacred words*; *The works that I do, bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me*, John 5. 36. And, *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had ſin*, *John* 15. 24. If it ſhould be ſaid, That thoſe men who ſpeak of the *Light within them*, do not pretend, that it is any way repugnant to *Goſpel-light*, but indeed the very ſame; I would gladly know, Whether their ſuppos'd *Light* have any *dependence* on the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, either for it's *exiſtence*, or *approbation*? if they ſay, it has not (as they are oblig'd, I ſuppoſe, by their *Way* to do) I demand, Whether it be a *Divine*, or not a *Divine* Light? if they yield, that it is no *Divine* Light, then certainly the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* being confirm'd *immediately* from *Heaven*, to be a *Divine* Light manifeſted to the world to ſhew it the *Way* to *Bliſs*, ought *ſolely* to be look'd upon, and eyed as our *Guide*, appointed by *God*, to bring us to *Salvation*. But if they will ſay, It is a *Divine Light*, then it

muſt

to *Salvation*: the *other* (viz. the *Apostles*) publish'd a *Doctrine* beyond *Mans Reason* to comprehend, or to see a *necessity* of, in respect of his *eternal welfare*; and therefore there had been no cause why the People should have credited them, yea, they ought in reason to have despis'd them as *Impostors*, if they had not both told them that they had *Authority* for what they did *immediately* from *God*, and likewise had prov'd the same by *immediate Testimony* (as they did) from *Heaven*. But the *Enthusiasts*, here discours'd of, do no *Miracle*, and therefore seeing they labour to set up a *new Guide* in the world, *independent* on the *Word of God*, for the governing men in the whole course of their lives, as well for *Doctrine*, as *Practice*, they ought not in reason to have any *credit* given them, for as much as *That* (whatever it be) which has not the manifest *stamp* of *Divine Authority* upon it, cannot without *injustice* exclude a *formerly* establish'd *Divine Law*, and be plac'd *it self* in stead thereof. This was one principal cause, why our *blessed Saviour*, being about to *abrogate* the *Law* of *Moses*,

and

and to *introduce his own* in it's room, did many great *Miracles*, to evidence that *he* was ſent of *God*, as appears by theſe his own *ſacred words*; *The works that I do, bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me*, John 5. 36. And, *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had ſin*, *John* 15. 24. If it ſhould be ſaid, That thoſe men who ſpeak of the *Light within them*, do not pretend, that it is any way repugnant to *Goſpel-light*, but indeed the very ſame; I would gladly know, Whether their ſuppos'd *Light* have any *dependence* on the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, either for it's *exiſtence*, or *approbation*? if they ſay, it has not (as they are oblig'd, I ſuppoſe, by their *Way* to do) I demand, Whether it be a *Divine*, or not a *Divine* Light? if they yield, that it is no *Divine* Light, then certainly the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* being confirm'd *immediately* from *Heaven*, to be a *Divine* Light manifeſted to the world to ſhew it the *Way* to *Bliſs*, ought *ſolely* to be look'd upon, and eyed as our *Guide*, appointed by *God*, to bring us to *Salvation*. But if they will ſay, It is a *Divine Light*, then it

muſt

must either *evidence* it self by *it self* to be so; (which the very *Scripture*, as I have shewn, cannot do in it's *own* behalf) or else receive it's *approbation* and *testimony* from *something* that is evidently *Divine*; which besides the *Holy Scripture* attested by *Miracles* to be so, can be nothing else but *Miracles* themselves. And neither of these give *witness* to the pretended *Light*; not the *Scripture*, as appears both from what has been already said; and from this also, that in case the *Scripture* were not extant in the world, yet would the *Light* spoken of be held by its abettors, to have the very same *authority* and *efficacy*, it is now suppos'd to have. And as for *Miracles*, the pretence to them, if any were made, would be frivolous, since they are no more *visible*, than the *Light* which is said to be *within*, is apparent to our eyes. Thus much for the pretended resemblance between the *Light* which *Moses*, and the *Apostles* were directed by; and the *Conceit* which misleads these *Enthusiasts*. And as for any likeness between the *Light* that the *Holy Prophets* had, and which these men boast of,

'twill

'twill easily appear, there's likewise none at all, if we do but consider, that the *Prophets* stuck close to the *Law* of *Moses*; their office, being either to *press* the *spiritual sense*, and intent of it to the People, who too generally thought the *external* observance of it, was all that *God* requir'd at their hands; or else to foretel *future Judgments* and *Mercies*, and that with respect particularly had to the *breach* or *keeping* of the *Law*, save only in the case of the *Messias*, which was of *general* Concern, as respecting the benefit of *Mankind*. But as for the *Rule* of their *life* and *conversation*, whether in regard of *Doctrine* or *Manners*, they held none but the known *Jewish Law*, together with the rest of the *Nation*.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

The latter Assertion, concerning The Rule *of* Faith, *wherein it is held by some of the Reformation to consist; with reflections made about the verity of the Assertion.*

HAving by way of digression cast mine eye upon the weak Conceptions of the *Enthusiasts*, and discover'd them to be vain and frivolous Opinions, I return to my more serious and intended course, to make enquiry, what truth the *Assertion* of the *latter* mention'd sort of *Controvertists*, belonging to the *Reformation*, has in it, *viz.* that

All things necessary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Understanding.

What the *Patrons* of this Opinion here call *Things necessary to Salvation*, they otherwhile nominate *Fundamental Points*, that is, *Divine Truths*, the *explicit* know-

knowledge whereof they hold neceſſary to *every* mans *Salvation*, as in due conſequence to their Aſſertion they are obliged to do; for to whom every thing *neceſſary* is clearly made known by *Scripture*, of him every *ſuch thing* is of neceſſity to be expreſly believed. To make their Aſſertion therefore good, 'twill be requiſite for them to prove, that all *fundamental Points*, may *clearly* be known by *Scripture alone* of *every man*; which how they ever be able to do, I cannot in the leaſt apprehend. For *clearly* to know a thing, is to have an *explicit* knowledge of it; ſince then there are but *two* ways or means (I think) ſo much as imaginable of coming in a rational way to the *explicit* knowledge of *Fundamental Truths* by *Scripture alone*, (ſo as that a *firm* aſſurance may be had thereof, and without *ſuch* aſſurance, 'twill be by meer *chance*, if *Fundamentals* be *explicitly known*; and conſequently, the attaining *Salvation* will be an *uncertain* and *hazardous* thing, even then, when the *beſt* means are us'd for the ſame) *viz.* either by gathering from it, that *ſuch* and *ſuch* Truths contain'd therein, are all the

fundamentals of the Whole Chriſtian Faith; or elſe, by gaining an *explicit* knowledge of *all Doctrinal Truths* in it *whatſoever*, or, at leaſt, in that *part* or *parts* of it, which comprehend *all fundamental Points*; if neither of theſe two ways of coming to the *explicit* knowledge of *all fundamentals* be practicable by *every* man, then, I doubt, 'twill be a *Task* too difficult ever to be clearly made out, That *All things neceſſary to ſalvation, are clear in Scripture to every underſtanding*. And that neither of the mentioned ways are practicable by *every* one, ſeems evident. For that it cannot be known by *Scripture* alone, that *ſuch* and *ſuch* Doctrines contained in it are *all* the *fundamentals* of the *whole* Chriſtian Faith, is the acknowledgment of the *Propoſers* and *Defenders* of the Aſſertion Treated of. And that *all Doctrinal Truths* contain'd in the whole *Scripture*, or in a conſiderable Part of it, cannot be *explicitly* known by *every* man, needs no further confirmation (I ſhould think) than barely to reflect, how far it is from all probability, that *all Mechanicks*, *Labourers*, *Servants*, and

and *multitudes* beſide, that make up the *Maſs* of mankind, or even perhaps any *one* of them ſhould be able to get an *explicit* knowledge of *all doctrinal Verities* in *Holy Writ*, or in a *conſiderable* Part of it. Neither, ſome perhaps would here reply, is neceſſary; for in whatſoever *Book* or *Books* of *Scripture* it can be certainly known, that *all Fundamentals* are clearly contain'd, the *ſumm* of all the *Doctrines* therein, need only be *explicitly* known, and not of the *whole Bible*, or a *great* Part of it. 'Tis very right; but I can by no means underſtand what way we can be aſcertain'd, that *all Fundamentals* are *clearly* contain'd in any *one* Book of *Scripture*, or in *fewer* at leaſt, than in ſo many of the whole *Canon* of the *New Teſtament*, as have been always held of unqueſtionable *Divine Authority* in the *Catholick Church*. For that *all Fundamentals* are not *clearly* contain'd in any *one* Book of *Scripture*, I have this to ſay, becauſe, If it were otherwiſe, they would moſt probably be in one of the four *Goſpels*; take then Saint *Lukes*, which is the fulleſt of them all, yea, ſupply out

of the reſt, if there be any conceiv'd neceſſary Truth awanting in his, which is in theirs; and yet, we ſhall find no clear mention made of *ſalvation* to be had by *Chriſt*, without the obſervance of the *Moſaical Law*; for ſeeing it was given by *God*, and never declar'd *abrogated* by our Bleſſed *Saviours* either *Preaching*, or *Example*, but both ways confirm'd, there can be nothing ſpoken of *Faith* in *Chriſt* in any of the *Goſpels*, which is of force enough to prove, That thoſe who embrac'd *Chriſts Doctrine*, were not ſtill oblig'd to keep *Moſes* his *Law*. Yea, the practice of Saint *Peter* (till the *viſion* of the *four-footed Beaſts of the earth, and wild Beaſts, and Creeping things, and Fowles of the air deſcending from Heaven*, Acts 10.) and of the whole *Church* alſo ſufficiently witneſs, that without a further *Revelation* than any *manifeſt* in our *Saviours* time, the obſervation of *Moſes Law* ſhould have always continued, and been held not only *lawful* to be us'd, but of the ſame *neceſſity* to be kept, which it had ever been by the *Jews*. So that the whole thing here remaining to be ſatisfied

fied in, is, whether or no, it be a *Fundamental Point* of *Christian Doctrine*, That *Jesus Christ*, without the obſervance of the *Judaical Law* comprehending it's Rites and Ceremonies, is ſufficient for *ſalvation*. Hence then it appearing evident, That *all Fundamentals* are not *clearly* contain'd in any *one*, or in *all* the *Goſpels*, I ſee not how any *fewer* (at leaſt) than thoſe Books of the *New Teſtament*, whoſe *Divine Authority* have been never queſtion'd in the Church, can reaſonably be thought (ſince all *Fundamentals* are not definitely known and ſo cannot be pointed out *where* they be) to comprehend *all Fundamental Truths*. And even thoſe Books contain *Doctrines* ſo many, ſo diſpers'd, and ſo variouſly phras'd, that certainly, no conſiderate knowing perſon could once entertain a ſerious thought, that the *generality* of *Mankind* is capable of *explicitly* knowing them *all*.

Nor is it, what I have hitherto ſaid, the whole ſcruple I have about this Opinion, That, *all things neceſſary to ſalvation, are clear in Scripture to every underſtanding*; For if it were indeed a true

Aſſertion, then would *Scripture* be the *Rule of Faith*, *immediately* (or without the *Churches ſenſe* upon it) to *every* one, and conſequently, no man could of right be *excommunicated* (or excluded from partaking of *Chriſtian* Ordinances and Priviledges) for holding and maintaining any *Error*, though oppoſite to an *Article* of *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Faith*, if ſo be he were fully perſwaded in his own thoughts, that it was a *Truth* to be *plainly* found in *Scripture*; whilſt none ought to be blam'd, cenſur'd, or any ways moleſted (ſome of which certainly, he that is *excommunicated*, falls under) for following the *Rule of Faith*, which yet (ſuppoſing the *Scripture* to be *immediately* ſo to *every* man) every one doth, who is fully poſſeſs'd in his own mind, that his Opinion though never ſo *dangerous* in it ſelf, is rightly grounded on *Holy Writ*. Yea, (if it were truly ſo, That *Scripture*, is the *Rule of Faith* in manner aforeſaid) though a man ſhould for ſome ſiniſter end broach an *Error*, contrary to an *Article of Faith*, yet if he ſtood conſtantly to't, that it was his real Opinion and belief

that

that the ſame was a *Divine Truth* plainly ſet forth in *Scripture*, (if no reaſonable proof were able to be made out that he profeſs'd otherwiſe than he thought) no *excommunication* could in that caſe *legally* be pronounc'd againſt him; becauſe, that as to *outward* appearance, he followed the *Rule of Faith*, which the *Church* can only take *cognizance* of; *Eccleſia non judicat, niſi de externis.*

Some peradventure would not ſtick to interpoſe, and be ſo unreaſonable as to ask me, what harm would accrew if there were no *Excommunication*, or *Church Diſcipline* at all exercis'd in reſpect of mens opinions in Points of *Doctrin*? To ſuch a fooliſh demand I ſhould return in anſwer, that ſince the *Chriſtian Religion*, was inſtituted by *God* to be a *Way* or *Method* for bringing men to *Felicity*, and that the ſame undoubtedly conſiſts of certain *Doctrins* as well as *Manners*, 'tis in effect to call into queſtion the *Wiſdom* of *God*, to ſuppoſe that any *conſtitutive* part of that *Religion* may be either alter'd or omitted without endangering *Salvation*, the *end* whereunto it was deſign'd. This allow'd

to be so, 'twill follow, that all who desire to become *Christians*, must resolve to embrace those *Doctrines*, and live according to those *Manners*, that the *Christian Religion* maintains. Which *Doctrines* and *Manners* (or necessary Means of Salvation) since they are not (as has been shewn) so *distinctly* and *signally* propounded in *Scripture*, as that every one who is concern'd to know them, can rationally be assur'd of himself, *which* they be; 'twas necessary from the beginning, is now, and ever will be, that some *select* known persons should be appointed to *declare* the *Contents* of the *Christian Religion*, or the *Terms* and *Conditions* upon which an *Admission* into *Christian Fellowship*, or the *Church*, is to be granted to *every* particular person, and the *Terms* and *Conditions* appearing to them to be perform'd, actually either to *admit* them themselves, or to constitute and appoint others to *do* it. If it were not always thus, every one that pleas'd might, at any time, justly joyn himself to the *Christian Society*, without performing any other *Conditions*, than he in his *own*

Judg-

Judgment thought requiſite to capacitate him to be a *Member* of the *Church*; nor could he, without injury done unto him, be debarr'd of *Chriſtian Community*; the Conſequence of which, muſt be granted to reach to this, That all the *Hereticks* who ever made profeſſion of *Chriſtianity*, and judg'd themſelves fit to be of the *Chriſtian Society*, and yet were excluded by the *Church* from her *holy Communion*, were *injuriouſly* dealt with; which if for certain they were, *one Faith*, *one Baptiſm* would conſiſt together with *all Hereſies*, *no Diſcipline*. *Some* then there always were, and ſtill muſt be, to *declare* the *Terms* and *Conditions* of *Chriſtian Community*; and 'tis equally reaſonable and requiſite, there ſhould likewiſe perpetually be *ſome* entruſted to *declare* when the ſame *Terms* and *Conditions* be, after *admiſſion* into the *Church*, *notoriouſly* violated; and upon *ſuch* violation to debar the *offender* by a juſt *Sentence*, from participating with the *Society* in their *Chriſtian Priviledges*; for otherwiſe, any one might violate the *Laws* of *Chriſtianity*, when and how he pleas'd, and yet nevertheleſs,

theless, should still have the same *legal* Right to enjoy at his pleasure, the *Priviledges* thereof, as if he had not broken them at all, since no man ought to be depriv'd of the *Priviledges* of the *Society*, whereof he is constituted a *Member*, till it be *solemnly* declar'd, he has rendred himself *incapable* of the same.

Besides the *Reasons* given, I have another strong *inducement* to make me think, That *All things necessary to Salvation are not clear in Scripture to every Understanding*, to wit, The *fifth Chapter of the first Part of the Epilogue to the Tragedie of the Church of England*, written by the *learned* and *ingenious* Mr. *Herbert Thorndike*, in which he directly and solidly opposes that opinion; yet I lately met with an ingenious Piece, I must confess, which attempts the confutation of this Chapter, but after *satis eloquentiæ*, concludes, (which shews the ineffectualness of his undertaking) thus, *Qui Deum votis solicitat, ut librum aperire dignetur, circumstantias cujusque loci animo revolvit, obscuriora confert cum apertioribus, in veritatem primæ magnitudinis oculorum defigit aciem, constan-*

conſtanter repudiat quicquid poſt diligentiſſimum ſcrutinium adverſum videatur, avidè complectitur quod non invitis conſequentiis inde elicitur, intervallum temporis ei in mora non erit, quò minùs intellectu conſequatur, quicquid inſolubili vinculo ſaluti annectitur; which words disprove in effect what ever had been ſaid againſt Mr. *Thorndike* before; for admitting all this were true, is it no more than a feaſable Task for the generality of men and women, to weigh duly the Circumſtances of every place of *Scripture*? to compare well the obſcure places of it, with thoſe which are plain? to diſtinguiſh aright of the more or leſs material Truths? to obſerve diligently what's oppoſite to the principal Doctrins? and to draw true Inferences from plain Texts? When I ſee cauſe to believe that every Plowman, Artificer, Labourer, Servant, with many other ſuch like, (not to name people of better education) can perform all this, I ſhall think the *fifth Chapter to the firſt Part of the Epilogue to the Church of England*, poſſible to be confuted. In the interim, I wonder how oft it were convenient to read, or hear the

Scri-

Scripture read over, before an ordinary Lay-man could in prudence begin to consider of the Circumstances of every place of it, and how long after he would be in weighing them well; What time, I muse, would be allow'd him wherein to mark what is obscure, what plain; What sure way not to be deceiv'd, would he, I admire, take to hit aright of the most important Truths; And whence should we think him competently enough skill'd to draw right Consequences from evident Truths? if he could and should at length do whatsoever is prescrib'd, for understanding the necessaries to Salvation; what Religion in the mean time, I would gladly understand, would the poor *Seeker* be of? If the first Publisher of this opinion amongst us, that *All things necessary to salvation, are clear in Scripture to every Understanding*, had foreseen the lamentable use which was of late, and still is made of it, he would, I believe, have been more cautious, than when he had with great industry and learning, confuted the *Papal Infallibility*, to have propos'd a way for setting up a *Pope* in every

every private mans breaſt, as by the mentioned *Aſſertion*, he has done; whilſt every one is certainly *infallible* in that wherein he cannot unleſs he will himſelf, be deceived; and *ſuch* is each one in the *neceſſary Points of Religion*, to whom the *Scripture is clear in all things neceſſary to ſalvation*, ſeeing he may *clearly in thoſe*, if he pleaſe, underſtand the *Scripture*, which being *infallible*, will make him *infallible* alſo, ſo far as he *rightly* underſtands it.

SECT. VII.

Whether the Rule of Faith affords Infallible, or but Moral certitude of Chriſts Doctrine? Whether we may not now, in our days, have as great certainty thereof, as the Diſciples of the Apoſtles had? And whether the like certainty which they had, be not enough for the Church of the preſent and future Ages?

ALthough I have hitherto made no diſcovery wherein the *Rule of Faith* ſeems *rightly* to be placed; yet have I in pro-

proſpect ſomething (I hope) tending to my ſatisfaction in the ſearch therof. But before I ſet my ſelf to manifeſt what it is, I'le firſt endeavour ſo far as I am able to underſtand, what certainty the *Rule of Faith* affords, whether *infallible*, or ſuch only as excludes *actual doubting*. Thoſe who aſſert the former, ſay, That *Chriſts Doctrine* is, and ought to be *infallibly* certain to us; they who affirm the latter, ſay, That it is only *morally* certain, (and that's ſufficient) *quoad nos*. Neither of theſe, in my opinion, if candidly interpreted, ſpeak amiſs. For the aſſerters of it's *moral* certitude only, do not (I conceive) think it *uncertain*, in any degree whatſoever, but would be ready to explode any ſuch ſpeech as this, 'tis ten thouſand, or an hundred thouſand to one, but no more; that this, which we call, the *Chriſtian Faith*, is the very *Doctrine* of *Salvation* which *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* taught; for they ſtedfaſtly averr (if I ſtrangely miſunderſtand them not) an *abſolute* certainty, but not by an *infallible* way, whilſt to be *infallibly* certain of a thing, is to be under an *impoſſibility*

possibility to be deceiv'd about it; and whatever is *Impossible* implies a *Contradiction* to the *reality* of it; but it implies no *Contradiction* that mens *Senses* and *Understandings* (by which they come to the knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*, if ever) at least consider'd in themselves, should judge amiss and deceive them. And therefore although *certainty* excludes all *possibility* of mistake so far as we are really certain of a thing; yet it implies no *Contradiction* that we should think we are certain, when indeed we are mistaken, because mens *Senses* may possibly delude them; neither is the *Intellect* necessarily void of *Error* in it's *judgments*, but is capable as well of *Falshood* as of *Truth*. This notwithstanding when a man exercises those *Faculties* that *God* has given him upon a due Object, in right Circumstances, and acts according to the utmost power of those *Faculties* rightly qualified, it implies a *Contradiction* (yet not immediate but by consequence) that so doing he should be deceived; forasmuch as it would call into question either the *Wisdom*, or the *Power*,

or

or the *Goodneſs* of *God*, to beſtow a *Faculty* to do a thing with, if the ſame being in right plight, and duly exercis'd on a fit Object, in convenient Circumſtances, ſhould not perform what it was given for. To inſtance, if mens *eyes* and *ears* rightly diſpos'd for *ſeeing* and *hearing*, ſhould not truly diſtinguiſh *colour* from *colour*, and *ſound* from *ſound*, the Objects being plac't at a fit diſtance, and in a proper medium, would it not imply that the *Maker* of them was ſome way *deficient*? The like may as truly be ſaid of the *Intellect*, or of any other *Faculty* in Man, ſo that the *Rule of Faith*, or that *Means* which conveys *Chriſts Doctrine* to Mans knowledge, if inſtituted (as all agree it is) by *God*, muſt needs give *infallible* aſſurance thereof, ſo often as nothing is lacking on Mans part, to fruſtrate the ſame. And therefore from what I gather from the whole, I am ſatisfied that the Diſpute about the *Infallibility* of the *Rule of Faith*, is more ſpeculative and quaint, than uſeful and neceſſary.

Where-

Wherefore, ſeeing no further cauſe of ſcruple about this matter, I'le be making forward to enquire, *wherein* the *Rule of Faith* doth conſiſt. And as to this, in general I am thus far aſſur'd, That the right deciſion of the *Queſtion*, lies wholly between the *Scripturiſts*, and *Traditioniſts*. For as for thoſe perſons who require an immediate aſſiſtance of the *Holy Spirit* to aſcertain the *Truth of Chriſts Doctrine*, their requeſt is unreaſonable; whilſt, if it were neceſſary to be granted, God would be obliged to continue a *miraculous* way of inſtructing in the *Faith* to the worlds end; (for what elſe is a *Miracle*, but an *effect* proceeding *immediately* from *God*, without any dependence on *intermediate* Cauſes for it's exiſtence, ſuch as the *certainty* of *Chriſts Doctrine* would be, if grounded either on *Popes* being *inſpir'd*, or *General Councils*, or *private perſons*) and be neceſſitated to *extraordinary* ways, when *ordinary* means would ſerve. For if we reflect on the *Means* by which the *Diſciples* of the *Apoſtles* came to the knowledge of *Chriſts Doctrine*, we are ſtraightway

aſſur'd, it was by *hearing*, *Rom.* 10. 17. a common and uſual, not an *extraordinary* and *miraculous* way of learning *Truth*. If then the *Scholars* of the *Apoſtles* had *ſufficient* certainty of their *Faith*, and that as *great* certainty is brought down to us, as they had, we ſhould be very unreaſonable to require more. To know whether indeed we have, or no, is to be reſolv'd by knowing this; Whether the *Means* by which *Chriſts Doctrine* is convey'd to us, be as *ſafe* and *ſure* to truſt to for *us*, as their *Ears* were to them; (for what matters it as to the *certainty* of a thing, whether it be tranſmitted through *one* only *medium*, or *thouſands*, if they be all of *equal* merit to give credit to?) the endeavour after ſatisfaction in which *Doubt*, ſhall be the ſubject of my next *enquiry*; the difficulty of reſolving of which, will lye in the clearing of theſe two Points. Firſt, whether the knowledge of a *Matter* of *Fact* (ſuch as the *Preaching* of the *Goſpel* was) may be as *certainly* tranſmitted from *one Generation* to *another*, as from the *Mouth* of one man to another mans *Ears*? Secondly,

In

In caſe it may, whether the knowledge of the *Chriſtian Religion* has been actually ſtill tranſmitted with as much certainty from one Generation to another, as it was from the *Apoſtles* Mouths to their *Auditors* Ears?

As to the clearing of the *former* Doubt, it depends upon the reſolving of this, Whether a *Truth* which is *once* deliver'd and receiv'd, may be ſo again over and over *perpetually*? For if it may (and what queſtion is there to be made of it's truth, competent means being had for doing it with?) then may the knowledge of a *Matter* of *Fact* be as *certainly* tranſmitted from *one Generation* to *another*, as from the *Mouth* of *one* Man to *another* Mans Ears; For ſince the *certainty* of the conveyance of the *truth* of a thing ſaid or done, depends upon the *faithful* delivery and reception of it, what ſhould hinder but that the ſame thing *may* be perform'd by *more*, which is by *one*, and *oftner* which is *once*, and *always* which is *often*, provided *ſufficient means* be *had* and *uſed* for *doing* the ſame?

But whether the *Christian Faith* has been always faithfully transmitted from *Age* to *Age*, is harder to resolve; and yet seeing it was a thing seizable, 'twill be satisfaction enough to me (without tracing the successive handing it down from time to time) that it was really done, if the *Motives* for doing it be found to be such, would *actually* incline men to the *effectual* performance of it; as to me, it seems plain they will; for being the very *greatest* and *strongest* in themselves imaginable, *viz.* the *Hopes* and *Fears* of *everlasting Bliss and Misery*, how could they chuse but work *more* powerfully on so many mens minds as should duly weigh their *merit*, than *Motives* of *lesser* Consequence would do? and yet we see what variety of things of *ancient* time has been so *securely* brought down to *our* days, that we scruple not at all their *truth*, notwithstanding that the *Motives* for their continued conveyance were incomparably *inferior* to those, which *Christs Doctrine* has ever had for the *assured faithful* transmitting it to the present Age.

But

But againſt this conceiv'd force of the *Hopes* and *Fears* of *endleſs Bliſs* and *Miſery*, I find it ſmartly thus urg'd; *What a wild ſuppoſition is this, That Moral Motives and Arguments, working on a free Principle, the will of Man do neceſſarily produce their effect? Is it neceſſary, that the Hopes of Heaven, and the Fears of Hell ſhould keep Chriſtians conſtant to the Doctrine of Chriſt? And is it not as neceſſary, that theſe Arguments ſhould prevail upon them to the practice of it? It is in vain to go about to demonſtrate, That all men muſt be good who have ſufficient Arguments propounded to them, when experience tells us the contrary. Nay, it is in reaſon impoſſible, that Moral Arguments ſhould be of a neceſſary and infallible efficacy, becauſe they are always propounded to a free Agent, who may chuſe whether he will yield to them, or not. Indeed, it is always reaſonable men ſhould yield to them, and if they be reaſonable, they will; but ſo long as they are free, it can never be infallibly certain they will. And if men be not free, it is no vertue at all in them to be wrought upon by theſe Arguments. For what virtue can it be in*

any man, to entertain the Chriſtian Doctrine, and adhere to it accordingly, if he do all this neceſſarily, that is, whether he will, or no?

The prevalent force of this argument againſt what it was primarily writ, I diſpute not; but ſo far as it ſeems to make againſt what I have aſſerted of the operative vertue of the *Hopes* and *Fears* of *Bliſs* and *Miſery*, upon the minds of thoſe who throughly ponder the weighty concern of *eternal Pain* and *Joy*; it's whole ſtrength (I conceive) is founded on the three following *Suppoſitions*, which are not (in my apprehenſion) ſufficient ſupports for the Structure built upon them.

The *firſt* Suppoſition is this, That if *Moral Motives* produce a certain and *conſtant* Effect, the ſame is a *neceſſary* Effect, and deſtroys the *Liberty* of the *Will*. The *ſecond* is, That the *Freedom* of Mans *Will*, conſiſts in being at full liberty, or in an indifferency *actually* to refuſe or accept what is propounded to it, let the *Motives*, *Circumſtances* and *frame* of *Mind* at the time of the propoſal be what they will.

will. The *third* ſuppoſition is, That the *ſame* Motives muſt have the *ſame* operation and efficacy on mens Minds, as well to the ſincere *practice*, as conſtant *belief* of *Chriſts Doctrine*. Now if none of theſe *Suppoſitions* be a ſufficient firm foundation for the *Arguments* rais'd upon them, the whole *Fabrick* will come to ruin in their diſſolution. And that none of them has ſolidity enough for a good foundation of what is laid thereon, I am apt, for the Reaſons hereafter given, to think.

For, that the ſuppoſal of *certain* and *conſtant* Effects proceeding from *Moral Motives* would include the deſtruction of the *Liberty* of the *Will*, I cannot therefore believe, becauſe plowing and ſowing, planting of vineyards, merchandizing, the ſtudy of all Arts and Sciences, the making of Laws, and even the generation of Mankind, are all of them the Effects of *Moral Inducements*, and yet not any of theſe ſhall ever fail, ſo long as the *Motives*, which *incline* men unto them, continue in the world. Neither will any man (I preſume) ſay, that the *Will* is the leſs *free* therefore, or that

men do theſe things *whether they will or not.* The Iſſue of which will be, That either a *neceſſary* effect is conſiſtent with *Freedom* of *Will*, (whatever it truly be) or elſe that a *certain* and *conſtant* effect, is not the ſame with a *neceſſary* effect, which is enough (as I ſuppoſe) to be ſaid of the *firſt* ſuppoſition.

Yea, and of the *ſecond* alſo; for if *Moral Motives* may be ſuch, as that they'l *certainly* in ſome men incline the *Will*, as has been ſhewn by the Inſtances of Agriculture, Planting of Vineyards, Merchandizing, the ſtudy of Arts and Sciences, and even the propagation of Mankind in the World effected by them, they may be; then does not the *Freedom* of the *Will* conſiſt in this, that the *Will* is at full liberty, or in an indifferency, *actually* to refuſe or accept, what is propounded to it, let the *Motives* be never ſo *ſtrong*, the *Circumſtances* as *cogent* as may be, and the *ſoul* in a condition as prone, as poſſibly, to be inclin'd by them. If it were reply'd, That although *Moral Motives* may be ſuch, as that they'l *certainly*, in ſome *Circumſtances* incline the

Wills

Wills of ſome men; yet, the reaſon of that is not, becauſe the *Will could* not, if it *would*, always reject what it imbraces; but becauſe the *Motives* are ſo *ſutable* and *grateful* to the *preſent* diſpoſition of the *Mind* that it *will* not refuſe them, I ſhould readily grant it; and thence withal acknowledge, that the *Will*, if it *would*, *could* undoubtedly reject any Object in any Circumſtances whatſoever; but conſtant experience ſhews us, that it often falls out by reaſon of the *Motives*, the *Circumſtances*, and the *preſent* diſpoſition of the *ſoul*, that by no means it *will* refuſe what is offer'd, and ſo, as to the *certainty* of the effect, do the ſame thing, as if it could not have done otherwiſe. For, whenſoever a thing is adjudg'd the *alone* convenient, and fit *medium*, to the compaſſing of an *end* which is fully reſolv'd on to be obtain'd, if the *Will* ſhould reject it, 'twould in ſuch caſe contradict (which is impoſſible) it's own *nature*. For example, Would it not denote a *contradictory* oppoſition in that mans *Will*, who, if in imminent danger to be drown'd, but deſirous by all means poſſible to ſave his

his life, ſhould refuſe to get upon a *Plank*, when he plainly ſaw, and was fully ſatisfied, there was no *other* way, but by doing it, to eſcape immediate drowning? For, were it not in effect to be both *deſirous*, and *not deſirous*, to ſave his life in the very ſame moment of time? which being a thing *impoſſible* to be done, clearly manifeſts, that the very *nature* of the *Will* requires, that *ſome* things, in *ſome* Circumſtances be *certainly* embraced by it, and conſequently, that the *Freedom* of the *Will*, may conſiſt together with the *certainty* of *events*, which flow from *Moral inducements*. That, this notwithſtanding, and how there may be *Virtue* in embracing Chriſtianity ſhall be ſeen hereafter in the tenth *Section*.

The *third* Suppoſition, *viz.* That the *ſame* Motives muſt have the *ſame* operation on mens Minds, as well to the *ſincere* practice, as to the *conſtant* belief of *Chriſt*'s *Doctrine*, hath no evidence of truth in it, that I can diſcern, ſince 'tis much more difficult to be prevail'd with to live a *godly life*, than to hold faſt and propagate a *received Truth*; for to do this latter, no more

more is neceſſary, but to give a full *aſſent* thereto in our *Hearts*, and to *declare* the ſame by our *words* (the one of which is a thing, that the *Underſtanding* of neceſſity does, if the *Argument* or *Teſtimony* be convincing; the other is a matter of no difficulty at all to be perform'd) whereas 'tis neceſſary to the leading a *godly life* to ſtruggle much and often with manifold ſtrong *Tentations*, which by reaſon of Mans *corrupted nature* frequently become his *Maſter*. And therefore we daily ſee, that multitudes of people, who from a firm perſwaſion that *Chriſts Doctrine* is the only *Way* and *Means* to ſave from *Hell* and bring to *Heaven*, are very deſirous and ſtudious to have it *believ'd* and *continued* in the world, when yet they *live not* according to the *Rules* which it preſcribes. But admit it were otherwiſe, and that none regarded the continuance of *Chriſts Doctrine*, but ſuch as made it their *chief* care and buſineſs to obſerve it's *Precept*; yet ſo long as there ſhall be men and women that will truly weigh the *merit* of the *Motives*, which perſwade to the *belief* and *practice* of it, ſo long there ſhall never want

want thoſe that will ſtedfaſtly adhere and keep conſtant to them *both*; and ſuch there has ever been amidſt the worſt of Perſecutions, and will be in the baddeſt times, maugre even all the *lying Signs* and *wonders* of *Antichriſt* himſelf, when he ſhall appear in the world; and ſo the *Chriſtian Religion* ſhall continue till the conſummation of all things; and that not by virtue of any *miraculous* inſpiration from *Heaven*, but by being *tranſmitted* from *Age* to *Age*; of the truth of both which for the reaſons before ſhewn being well aſſur'd, I am got at length by ſeveral cloſe ſteps to the main *Querie* of all, *viz.* By *what Way*, or *Means Chriſts Doctrine* has been *Succeſſively* without *interruption* convey'd down to *our* days, and ſhall be ſo on *perpetually* while the world laſts.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

By what means the knowledge of a matter of Fact (such as the Preaching of the Gospel by Christ and his Apostles was) may be perpetuated. An examen of the force of the Romanists *main Argument, whereby they endeavour to shew, That Scripture cannot be the* Rule of Faith. *Whether the Scripture be not as intelligible in Points of Faith, as Tradition, or the Living Voice of the Church is.*

THAT a *Matter* of *Fact* (such as the *Publishing* of our *Saviours Doctrine* was) can no other way become known to *future Ages*, but either by some *Writing*, or by an *Oral delivery* of it, or by *both*, is beyond cavil, certain. And forasmuch, as no *Writing* can warrant its *own authentickness*, 'tis requisite for the due proof of the *authority* of any *Writing of ancient* time, that the same be ascertain'd to us by *Tradition*; so that although it were a confess'd Truth, That *Christian Doctrine* is

is wholly contain'd in ſome *one Writing* or *other*, yet we could have no *certainty* which is that very *Writing*, but by the *teſtimony* of *Tradition*. *Tradition* therefore is the *firſt* neceſſary *ſtep*, at leaſt, (if no more) which without an *immediate Revelation*, (a thing not, but through high preſumption to be expected) can ſafely lead us to the *knowledge* of the *Chriſtian Faith*. But whether in truth there be any *Writing* in which *Chriſts Doctrine* is ſo fully and clearly contain'd, that it needs no further aſſiſtance from *Tradition*, ſave only to *atteſt* its *authentickneſs* and *authority*, is a matter of further enquiry; For although thoſe *Books* we call *Canonical Scripture* be ſufficiently witneſſed by *Tradition* to be the *Word* of *God*, yet if neither *Tradition* moreover ſay, that they are of themſelves a *perfect Rule* of *Faith*; nor any ſuch affirmation or equivalent to it, be expreſly found in thoſe *Books*; nor yet any evident proof from *Reaſon* can be made appear, that they are ſo; their being the *Word* of *God* (for ſo is every *Divine Sentence* in them) is not enough to entitle them to the *Rule* of *Faith*,

Faith, or to be able to assure us *what* the *whole Will* of *God* in the *Gospel* is. But whether *Scripture*, *Tradition*, or *Reason*, aver so much, I'le omit the discussion of, till I have weighed what moment an *Argument* much insisted on to prove that *Scripture* is not the *Rule of Faith*, nor any *Part* thereof, bears. The *Argument* is this;

If *Scripture* be the *Rule of Faith* it must be in this respect, as the *Letter* of it is clearly significative of *Gods sense* in *Points* of *Faith* (because the thing signified by the *Letter* is the *Doctrine* of *Faith* it self, which the *Letter*, as the *Rule*, is to assure of) so that unless it *clearly* hold forth such a *plain determinate sense*, as that no other can be put upon it without manifest *injury* and *wresting*, it cannot be the *Rule of Faith*. And that it doth not hold forth such a sence, daily *Experience* shews, not only by the *different Comments* on it, but by the *dissensions* also of those who adhere to it as the *Rule of Faith*.

That the *Scripture* cannot be the *Rule of Faith*, or any *Part* of it, save as the *Letter* of it is *clearly* significative of *one* deter-

determinate ſenſe, to me, I confeſs, ſeems undeniable. But that the *Scripture* in nothing *neceſſary* to *Salvation* is ſo, I ſee no cauſe at all to believe, whilſt the *Reaſons* offer'd to prove it by, are (in my opinion) too weak to do it; for what matters it as to the *Scriptures* being the *Rule of Faith*, how many *different Commentaries* be upon it; or what quarrelling there be about the *ſenſe* of it in places not containing *Articles* of *Faith*? And that the *Scripture* in ſeveral grand *Articles* of *Faith*, yea in moſt, if not in all, is as clearly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*, as the *Tradition* of the *Church*, (whoſe *eaſineſs* to be underſtood, the *Traditioniſts* ſay qualifies it in one prime reſpect for the *Rule of Faith*) I thus, in a way agreeable to their own *Principles* and manner of diſcourſe, go about to make clearly evident.

The *Church diffuſive* cannot *immediately* declare her thoughts to any one, much leſs to every particular either perſon or Congregation of people; and therefore, whenſoever it has been thought neceſſary that the ſame ſhould be made known to any of her *Members* concerning a *Point* of *Faith*,

Faith, or which was by ſome pretended to be ſo, *She* has ever us'd to employ her *Chief Paſtors* (who could not be ignorant what the reſpective *Churches* under each ones *Charge* held in *Matters of Faith*) to impart her mind about it. And this thoſe *Paſtors* did effect, either by *Communicatory Letters*, or by meeting together, and giving their *Votes* in *Council*. Now whether of theſe *Ways* ſoever the *ſenſe* of the *Church diffuſive* was at any time made known, 'twas always done by expreſſing the ſame in ſome *determinate words* committed to *Writing*. If therefore *Paſtors*, *Parents*, *Guardians*, *Nurſes*, *Maſters of Families*, (*the chief Conveyers of Chriſtian Doctrine from Age to Age*) undertake to teach any thing as the *ſenſe* of the *Church*, they muſt (except they'l deceive their Hearers) do it either in the very *ſame* words in which the *Prelats* have caus'd it to be put in *Writing*, or in others *identified* to and with the *ſenſe* of them. And that either *Teachers*, or *Learners*, can ever be certain of ſuch *identification*, unleſs the *words* to which they are to be *identified* be clearly ſignificative of *one determinate*

ſenſe, I think is impoſſible: If ſo be therefore, there be any *Article* of *Faith* as clearly contain'd in *Scripture*, as they are in *Communicatory Letters*, or in the *Definitions* of *General Councils*, the ſame may be as *certainly* and *truly* learn'd by *Scripture*, as by *Tradition* or the *Living voice* of the *Church*, becauſe there is no other way (as was ſhewn) to be aſcertain'd of the *Churches ſenſe* but by *one* of thoſe Means. The latter nam'd of which (viz. the *Definitions* of *Councils*) having obtain'd in the *Church* to be preferr'd before the other, 'twill ſuffice, by comparing *Texts* of *Scripture* with *Definitions* of *Councils*, to try whether *thoſe* be not as *clear* and *plain* to be underſtood, in *Points* of *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Faith*, as *theſe* are. But to take the ſhorteſt Cut, becauſe the *Council* of *Trent* referrs men wholly to the *Creed*, call'd the *Nicene*, to learn the *Churches ſenſe* in thoſe *Articles* of *Faith*, which it contains; I will look no further into the *Councils*, but content my ſelf with ſetting down firſt the *Articles* of that *Creed*, and then the *Texts* of *Scripture* over againſt them, that by fairly comparing them together,

gether, I may satisfie my mind, whether or no the *Texts* of *Scripture* make out the *Articles* of *Faith* comprehended in the *Nicene Creed*, or any of them, as plainly as it doth; which if it be found to do, the *Objection* together with the *Reason* given, that, and why, the *Scripture* cannot be the *Rule* of *Faith*, or any *Part* of it, will be of no validity for what they were intended.

But yet, before I compare the *Texts* of *Scripture*, and the *Articles* of the *Creed* together; 'twill be fitting (because I said the *Council* of *Trent* sends us to the *Nicene Creed* to learn the *sense* of the *Church* in all those *Articles* which it contains) to transcribe the *Decree* of the third *Sess.* which is this.

Sacrosancta Oecumenica & Generalis Tridentina Synodus, &c. ante omnia statuit & decernit præmittendam esse Confessionem Fidei, Patrum exempla in hoc secuta, qui sacratioribus Conciliis hoc scutum contra omnes hæreses in principio suarum actionum opponere consueverunt, quo solo aliquando, & infideles ad fidem traxerunt, hæreticos expugnârunt & fideles confirmârunt. Quare

Symbolum Fidei, quo sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur, tanquam principium illud in quo omnes qui fidem Christi profitentur, necessariò conveniunt, ac fundamentum firmum & unicum, contra quod portæ inferni nunquam prævalebunt, totidem verbis quibus in omnibus Ecclesiis legitur, exprimendum esse censuit, quod quidem ejusmodi est.

Credo in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem factorem Cœli & Terræ, visibilium omnium & invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum filium Dei unigenitum, & ex Patre natum ante omnia secula, Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero; genitum non factum; consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt: Qui propter nos homines, & propter nostram salutem descendit de Cœlis, & incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria *Virgine, & homo factus; crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub* Pontio Pilato, *passus & sepultus est; & resurrexit tertiâ die secundum Scripturas, & ascendit in Cœlum; sedet ad dextram Patris, & iterum venturus est cum gloriâ judicare vivos & mortuos, cujus Regni non erit finis. Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum & vivificantem, qui ex*

Patre

Patre Filioque procedit; qui cum Patre & Filio simul adoratur & conglorificatur, qui locutus est per Prophetas. Et unam Sanctam, Catholicam, & Apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum, & vitam venturi seculi. Amen.

Having here set down the *Nicene Creed*, as it is in the *Trent Council*, I shall straight compare the *Texts* of *Scripture* in the vulgar Edition with the *Words*, wherein that *Creed* is expres'd, in all the *Articles* of it, save only in that of the *Blessed Trinity*, which although, I make no doubt, but 'tis demonstrable by *Scripture*; yet, in regard it cannot be evidenced with that brevity which the rest may be; and that if *Scripture* be in *other* Articles as clear as the *words* of the *Creed* are, 'tis enough to overthrow the Objection; (whose supposd strength lyes in this, That it shews *Scripture* not to be plainly significative of *one determinate sense* in *any Article* of *Faith* whatsoever) I'le begin with this *Article* of the *Creed*; *Qui descendit de Cœlis, propter nos homines, & propter nostram salutem*; and descend to the rest in their due order.

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Qui descendit de Cœlis	*Exivi à Patre & veni in mundum, iterum relinquo mundum & vado ad Patrem.* *Dicunt ei Discipuli ejus, ecce nunc palam loqueris, & Proverbium nullum dicis,* Joh. 16. 28, 29.
Propter nos homines, & propter nostram salutem;	*Factus est obtemperantibus sibi omnibus causa salutis æternæ,* Heb. 5. 9. *Non est in aliquo alio salus, nec enim aliud nomen est sub cælo datum hominibus in quo oportet nos salvos fieri,* Acts 4. 12.

Et

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Et incarnatus est	*Verbum caro factum est*, Joh. 1. 14. *Multi seductores exierunt in mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum venisse in carne, hic est seductor & antichristus*, 2 Joh. 7.
De Spiritu Sancto ex Maria *Virgine*,	*Cùm esset desponsata Mater ejus* Maria Joseph, *antequam convenirent, inventa est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto*, Matth. 1. 18. *Dixit* Maria *ad Angelum, quomodo fiet istud, quoniam virum non cognosco? Et respondens Angelus dixit ei, spiritus Sanctus superve-*

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	niet in te, & virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi, ideóque quod nascetur ex te Sanctum vocabitur Filius Dei, Luc. 1. 33, 34.
Et homo factus;	*Unus Deus, unus & Mediator Dei & hominum, homo Christus Jesus,* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *Si unius delicto multi mortui sunt, multò magis gratia Dei, & donum in gratia unius hominis Jesu Christi in plures abundavit,* Rom. 5. 15.
Crucifixus etiam sub Pontio Pilato,	*Vide* Matth. 27. Marc. 15. Luc. 23. John 19.

Christus

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Pro nobis	*Christus semel pro peccato passus est, justus pro injustis, ut nos offerret Deo, mortificatus quidem carne, vivificatus autem spiritu,* 1 Pet. 3. 18.
	Dignus es accipere librum & aperire signaculum ejus, quoniam occisus es, & redemisti nos Deo in sanguine tuo ex omni tribu, & lingua, & populo, & natione, Rev. 5. 9.
Passus,	Pilatus *mirabatur si jam obiisset, & accersito Centurione interrogabat eum, si jam mortuus esset; & quum cognovisset*

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	à Centurione, donavit corpus Joseph. Marc. 15. 44, 45. *vide* Matth. 27. 50. Luc. 23.46. Joh.19. 30.
Et sepultus est;	*Et accepto corpore* Joseph *involvit illud in sindone munda, & posuit illud in monumento suo novo, quod exciderat in petra, & advolvit saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti, & abiit,* Matth. 27. 59, 60. *vide* Marc. 15. 46.Luc. 23.53. Joh. 19. 40,41,42.
Et resurrexit tertiâ die secundum Scripturas,	*Vide* Matth. 28. Marc. 16. Luc. 24. Joh. 20.

Et

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Et aſcendit in Cœlum, ſedet ad dextram Patris,	*Dominus quidem Jeſus poſtquam locutus eſt, aſſumptus eſt in cœlum, & ſedit à dextris Patris,* Marc. 16. 19. *vide* Luc. 24. 51. Act. 1. 9.
	Qui cùm ſit ſplendor gloriæ, & figura ſubſtantiæ ejus, portánſque omnia verbo virtutis ſuæ purgationem peccatorum faciens, ſedet ad dextram Majeſtatis in excelſis, Heb. 1. 3. *vide* Heb. 8. 1. 1 Pet. 3. 22.
Et iterum venturus eſt cum gloria judicare vivos & mortuos,	*Quoniam ipſe Dominus in juſſu, & in voce Archangeli, & in tuba Dei deſcendet de*

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	de Cœlo, & mortui in Christo resurgent primi, 1 Thess. 4. 16.
	Præcepit nobis prædicare populo, & testificari quia ipse est, qui constitutus est judex vivorum, & mortuorum, Acts 10. 42.
	Testificor coram Deo & Jesu Christo, qui judicaturus est vivos & mortuos, & per adventum ipsius & regnum ejus, 2 Tim. 4. 1.
	Qui reddent rationem ei, qui paratus est judicare vivos & mortuos, 1 Pet. 4. 5.
Cujus regni non erit finis.	*Regni ejus non erit finis,* Luc. 1. 33. *vid.* Rev. 11. 15.

Credo

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Credo unam ſanctam, Catholicam & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam.	*Euntes docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine Patris & Filii & Sancti Spiritus.* *Docentes eos ſervare omnia quæcunque mandavi vobis; & ecce ego vobiſcum ſum omnibus diebus uſque ad conſummationem ſeculi,* Matth. 28. 19, 20. *Ipſe eſt caput corporis Eccleſiæ,* Col. 1. 18. *Alias oves habeo quæ non ſunt ex hoc ovili, & illas me oportet adducere, & vocem meam audient, & fiet unum ovile & unus Paſtor,* Joh. 10. 16.

Conſi-

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
Confiteor unum Baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.	*Unus Dominus una Fides, unum Baptisma*, Ephes. 4. 5. *Pœnitentiam agite & baptizetur unusquisque vestrûm in nomine Jesu Christi in remissionem peccatorum vestrorum*, Acts 2. 38. *An ignoratis quia quicunque baptizati sumus in Christo Jesu, in mortem ipsius baptizati sumus?* *Consepulti enim sumus cum illo per Baptismum in mortem, ut quomodo Christus surrexit à mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita & nos in novitate vitæ ambulemus.*

Si

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	Si enim complantati facti ſumus ſimilitudini mortis ejus, ſimul & reſurrectionis erimus.
	Hoc ſcientes quia vetus homo noſter ſimul crucifixus eſt, ut deſtruatur corpus peccati, ut ultrà non ſerviamus peccato.
	Qui enim mortuus eſt, juſtificatus eſt à peccato, Rom. 6. *ver.* 1. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.
	Baptizare & ablue peccata tua invocato nomine ipſius, Acts 22. 16.
Et expecto reſurrectionem mortuorum,	*Si reſurrectio mortuorum non eſt, neque Chriſtus reſurrexit.*

Si

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	Si autem Christus non resurrexit, inanis ergo prædicatio, inanis est Fides vestra, 1 Cor. 15. *ver.* 13, 14.
Et vitam venturi seculi. Amen.	*Amen dico vobis, nemo est qui reliquerit domum, aut fratres, aut sorores, aut Patrem, aut Matrem,* &c. *propter me, & propter Evangelium, Qui non accipiet centies tantùm nunc in tempore,* &c. *& in seculo futuro vitam æternam*, Marc. 10. 29, 30. *Vide* Matth. 25. 46. 1 Cor. 15. *ver.* 52, 53, 54. 1 Thess. 4. *ver.* 16. 17.

Many

Many more *Texts* of *Scripture*, beſides theſe here produc'd, might, if need were, be added, for confirmation, That the mention'd *Articles* contain'd in the *Nicene Creed*, are as *plain* and *clearly* to be found in *Scripture*, as in *it*.

Granting, will the *Traditioniſt* peradventure ſay, the truth of what I here affirm; yet may both the *Scripture*, and the *Creed*, be *further* clear'd and explicated. No doubt, but they may, ſuppoſing them firſt to be *rightly* underſtood; but how they ſhould be that, unleſs they be plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*, I am not able to apprehend. If the *Traditioniſt* reply, yes, they may be underſtood *aright* from this, that men ſee the *ſame* things taught *dayly* among *Chriſtians*. I anſwer, That of *ſeveral Words* or *Sentences* compar'd together, it cannot with *certainty* be affirm'd, they import the *ſame* thing, ſave only by *thoſe* to whom they'r *known* to be plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*. Nor does this at all hinder, why as well the *Scripture* as the *Creed*, may not to the *multitude* be made *more* plain and eaſie to be underſtood, than

The words of the Creed.	The Texts of Scripture.
	Si autem Christus non resurrexit, inanis ergo prædicatio, inanis est Fides vestra, 1 Cor. 15. *ver.* 13, 14.
Et vitam venturi seculi. Amen.	*Amen dico vobis, nemo est qui reliquerit domum, aut fratres, aut sorores, aut Patrem, aut Matrem,* &c. *propter me, & propter Evangelium,* *Qui non accipiet centies tantùm nunc in tempore,* &c. *& in seculo futuro vitam æternam,* Marc. 10. 29, 30. *Vide* Matth. 25. 46. 1 Cor. 15. *ver.* 52, 53, 54. 1 Thess. 4. *ver.* 16. 17.

Many

Many more *Texts* of *Scripture*, beſides theſe here produc'd, might, if need were, be added, for confirmation, That the mention'd *Articles* contain'd in the *Nicene Creed*, are as *plain* and *clearly* to be found in *Scripture*, as in *it*.

Granting, will the *Traditioniſt* peradventure ſay, the truth of what I here affirm; yet may both the *Scripture*, and the *Creed*, be *further* clear'd and explicated. No doubt, but they may, ſuppoſing them firſt to be *rightly* underſtood; but how they ſhould be that, unleſs they be plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*, I am not able to apprehend. If the *Traditioniſt* reply, yes, they may be underſtood *aright* from this, that men ſee the *ſame* things taught *dayly* among *Chriſtians*. I anſwer, That of *ſeveral Words* or *Sentences* compar'd together, it cannot with *certainty* be affirm'd, they import the *ſame* thing, ſave only by *thoſe* to whom they'r *known* to be plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe*. Nor does this at all hinder, why as well the *Scripture* as the *Creed*, may not to the *multitude* be made *more* plain and eaſie to be underſtood, than

of *themselves* they can in reason be thought to *appear* to them. Yea, some people, I believe there be, whose *Intellects* are so weak and stupid, that scarce any one *single* form of words whatsoever, can be fully adapted to their *capacities*; whence even the *easiest* Catechisms that are fram'd, we see, are with much diligence explain'd by the *Catechist*; yea and not a few, I fear, of his own words us'd for explication of others, often stand in need themselves of exposition to some of his Auditors; so that what is very plain and easie to be understood by *some* men, may to *others* be obscure and difficult.

SECT. IX.

What the properties of the Rule *of Christian* Faith *be? and whether they agree to holy Scripture?*

ALthough I have clear'd the Scripture from the unjust imputation of unintelligibleness in Matters of Catholick Faith cast upon it; yet unless, besides, that

that it is *plainly significative of one determinate sense*, it hath likewise these two further Properties, *viz.* that it *contain all things of necessary Belief and Practice*; and *so, as that an explicit knowledge of them be attainable*, it cannot be the *Rule of Christian Faith*. For since the very Ground and Reason why some Scriptural Doctrines are call'd *necessary* in contradistinction to others otherwise, is from hence; that they are held necessary to be *plainly understood*, to the intent the *Credenda* of them may be *explicitly believed*, the *Agenda frequently practis'd* in order to salvation, all Necessaries must of necessity be so far distinctly known, as is requisite to that end and purpose. And therefore I find no satisfaction from the saying of those who tell us, that he who believes *all Doctrines clearly deliver'd* in *Scripture*, believes *all things necessary to Salvation, and much more*; because if they speak of an *implicit Belief*, that, in Necessaries to salvation is not sufficient; and to have an *explicit Belief* of all Doctrines (almost infinite) clearly held forth in Sacred Writ, is not a thing practicable. The three mentioned Qualifi-

lifications then, Firſt, That *Scripture be intelligible in Matters of Catholick Faith.* Secondly, That it be *comprehenſive of them.* Thirdly, That *they be diſtinguiſhable in Scripture*, (though not by it, for that I have formerly ſhewn is not to be expected) *from moſt other Truths* (I do not ſay all, for to have an exact Catalogue of all Neceſſaries diſtinct from every other Scriptural Doctrine, is not, as I think, poſſible; ſo neither, I am ſure neceſſary; becauſe if nothing neceſſary be omitted, it matters not how many Truths beſides what are neceſſary be explicitly known together with them) *clearly contained in it*, are all of them requiſite to Scripture, if we will have it to be the *Rule of Chriſtian Faith.* Which Qualifications, whether they do accord to Scripture, or no, let's make ſome tryal if we can diſcover.

Beſides what I have already ſaid to the *firſt*, (*viz.* That *Scripture* is *intelligible*, or plainly ſignificative of *one determinate ſenſe* in *neceſſaries* to *ſalvation*) many *Arguments* both from *it ſelf*, and the *Fathers*, are brought by the Learned to prove, that

it,

it, and the *ſecond* alſo, (namely, That the *Holy Scripture* comprehends whatſoever is of *neceſſary belief* and *practice*) pertain to *Holy Writ*; and if they were not ſtretch'd further by ſome, than they'l without *forcing* extend, I ſee not how they could reaſonably be deni'd to be convincing. For albeit *Scripture* be not clear in all things neceſſary to ſalvation to *every one*, yet it may be to *ſome* who are able to uſe the *beſt Means* attainable, for the underſtanding it in thoſe things *aright*. This the great *Promoter* and *Advancer* of the *Traditionary Doctrine Thomas Anglus ex Albiis*, in his *Sonus Buccinæ*, ſeems plainly to me to confeſs, who *Tract. 2. Paragr. 19.* in anſwer to this Objection, *Sancti Patres teſtantur ſacras Scripturas eſſe ſufficientes ad nos inſtruendos, & continere omnia quæ ad Fidem, & Mores ſpectant, & quidem ſine magno labore*; ſaith, *Aliud eſt omnia neceſſaria in ſacra Scriptura contineri, aliud eam eſſe Regulam*; *ſicut aliud eſt, eſſe aliquid rectum in ſe, aliud verò eſſe Regulam*; *ut enim Rectum fiat Regula debet eſſe applicabile*; *poſſunt autem ſic obſcurè vel diſperſè contineri neceſſaria in Libris ſacris,*

ut non nisi cum labore, & à solis doctis possint fieri vel agnosci certa. According to what is here writ, *Scripture* is not deny'd to have *rectitude* enough in it to be a *Rule*; and so might be the *Rule of Faith*, if it were but *applicable*, that is such, as might *certainly* be learn'd from it, *What things are revealed in it by God as necessary to bring men to Felicity.* Whether *therefore* the *sacred Scripture* be *such*, or no, shall be my next *Enquiry.*

Of the *three Qualifications* requisite to constitute *Scripture* the *Rule* of *Faith*, *two* are found to belong to it, *viz.* it's *intelligibleness in things necessary to salvation*; and it's *comprehensiveness of them.* The *third*, which is, That *those necessaries be distinguishable* from other *Scriptural truths*, so far as is requisite to gain an *explicit* knowledge of them, I will next so consider of, as to make it my business to search out, whether or no they may be *so distinctly* known, and in case they may, by what *Means* it is to be done. By what *Means* would some say, but by *Scripture*? For if by *Scripture* it self the *distinct* knowledge of them cannot be attained unto,

Scripture

Scripture will not of it *self* point us out our *Way* to *Heaven*, and consequently, is not the *Rule of Faith*. I deny the *Consequence*; for if *Scripture* be *intelligible in all things necessary to salvation*, and that by *any* Means we can attain to a *distinct* knowledge of them, we shall assuredly by *Scripture* be shewn our *Way* to *Heaven*, and consequently, *Scripture* will be the *Rule of Faith*; for that is (I conceive) the *Rule of Faith*, into which it is *finally* resolv'd as an *infallible Witness* of it, let the *Helps* antecedently requisite to that *Resolution* be what, or as many as they will, since these latter only direct us to *that*, which directs us our *Way* to *Bliss*.

Here some perhaps would be ready to offer another Objection, to this purpose; *Necessary Points* are reducible to a very *few*, perchance to this *one*, *To believe and trust in Jesus Christ for remission of sins* (and of this *Doctrine*, the *Scripture* it self teaches a *necessity*) which they might the more confidently insist on, because it seems to be confirm'd by that remarkable Instance of the penitent *Thief* on the *Cross*. To this might be answer'd, that although the

Thief on the *Croſs* who believ'd in *Chriſt* was ſav'd without an *explicit* knowledge of the *Reſurrection*, *Aſcenſion*, and *Coming to Judgment* of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, becauſe by reaſon of the *Circumſtances* he was in, *true holineſs*, or the *ſincere love of God in Chriſt* was wrought in his *heart*; yet it cannot be rationally inferr'd from thence, that the *Reſurrection*, *Aſcenſion*, and *Coming to Judgment* of our *Lord* are not *Points*, which the *Rule of Faith* holds forth, as *Articles* of *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Belief*. For what in ſome *extraordinary Circumſtances* may be an *efficacious* means to work *Contrition* and a *through* amendment of Life to *ſalvation* in *one*, the ſame will not be ſo to *others* in the *common* and *ordinary* courſe of Mans life; and to this muſt the *Rule of Faith* extend, I mean to afford *Motives*, or *Matters* of *Belief*, and *Precepts* of *good life* and *Manners*, *apt* and *convenient* to bring multitudes of people following their ſeveral *Vocations* to *dye* unto *Sin*, and to *live* unto *Righteouſneſs*, whoſe *Crown is everlaſting life* and *Bliſs*. *Several Neceſſaries* then there are in reſpect of *Mankind*, and although *every one* of them

be

be not abſolutely neceſſary for *every individual* perſon to *know*, yet in that they are *more generally* neceſſary to be *known*, the *Rule* of *Faith* would be *imperfect* if it wanted any *one* of them. And therefore, I conceive, I have very good ground and cauſe to think, that the *Fundamentals* of the *Chriſtian Religion* are *more* than *thoſe divine Truths* (whatever they be) which are ſo neceſſary, that not any *one* man can be ſav'd without an *expreſs* knowledge of them; becauſe *more Motives*, and *more Precepts*, will in all reaſon, be neceſſary to bring a *multitude* in *different Conditions*, and *various Circumſtances* to a true *ſenſe* of their *ſins*, and an *hearty* turning from them to *God*, than to work the *like effect* in ſome *one*, or a *few* perſons in ſome *advantageous* Circumſtances, which may ſupply the *defect* of ſeveral *Credenda* and *Agenda* in influencing the *Mind*, that otherwiſe will be neceſſary for the *converſion* of *others*, not in the *ſame* or *like helpful* Circumſtances with them; and ſo of *right* belong to the *Rule of Faith.*

The

The two paſt Objections ſolv'd, I return to my *Queries*, Whether or no, *all neceſſaries to ſalvation* be ſo far *diſtinguiſhable in Scripture* as to be *explicitly* known; and in caſe they be, by *what means* an *explicit* knowledge of them is attainable. If ſuch a knowledge of them be attainable, it muſt be by one of theſe four ways; Either by *Scripture* it ſelf; or by ſome other *Writing* of *Catholick* truth and authority; or by *evident Reaſon*; or laſtly, by *Tradition*. Not by *Scripture*, the *Scripturiſts* themſelves (as was ſaid before) acknowledge. Nor is there any other *Book* of *Catholick* truth and authority (I ever heard of) undertakes to direct to them. And as for *Principles* of meer *Reaſon*; or *Science* grounded on the *Credenda* and *Agenda* themſelves, we cannot expect to have any certain diſtinct notice of 'em from either of them, becauſe a *neceſſity* of ſuch *Truths* as are above *humane* ingeny, or meerly *poſitive* (as there be ſeveral of both ſorts in *Scripture*) is not to be learn'd from thence. There's but only one thing then remaining, which can poſſibly give intelligence of them,

and

and 'tis *Tradition*, taken either in this ſenſe, That *ſuch and ſuch places of Scripture have been ever held and taught to contain all neceſſaries to ſalvation*; an Aſſertion never (I think) maintain'd; or elſe in this ſenſe, as 'tis ſaid to be, *A conſtant uninterrupted courſe of teaching, learning and practiſing Chriſts Doctrine, ſet on foot by our bleſſed Saviour, and his Apoſtles, and continued by their Diſciples, and the ſucceeding Generations ever ſince*; which courſe, if it have been really taken, the difficulty of getting an *expreſs* knowledge of *Neceſſaries* contain'd in *Scripture* will *terminate* in knowing *what Divine truths* have been ſo convey'd, and then finding *Texts* in *Holy Writ parallel* thereunto. Firſt, then it muſt be ſought after; Whether *Chriſtian Doctrine* has by ſuch a continued courſe been brought down to us, or not? And ſecondly, *What* the *Truths*, if indeed there were any ſo brought down be?

SECT.

SECT. X.

An Enquiry, whether Christs Doctrine has been practically convey'd without intermission from the days of the Apostles unto ours? And of what validity. Four grand Arguments urg'd against the indefectibility of Tradition, are?

WHether *Christs Doctrine* has been *Orally* deliver'd and *practically* handed down to us without *interruption*, I shall by this that follows, labour to satisfie my self.

That there is no real Benefit accrues to *Christians* by the *Rule of Faith*, if the Things contain'd in it, be not *explicitly believ'd*, and *sincerely practis'd*, is, I presume, unquestionably true. The *exercise* therefore of *Christianity* (consisting in the *Profession* and *Practice* of *Christian Truths* and *Duties*) being the *End* for which the *Rule of Faith* (we'l suppose it *Scripture*) was given, and is preserv'd; 'twould

'twould be ſtrangely unreaſonable to think, that the *Means* ſhould have been ſo carefully kept in *all Ages*, as even with the hazard, yea, and loſs of life it hath often been; and the *End* it ſelf, for which it was ſo kept, ſhould not with *equal* care (at leaſt) have been regarded. For it cannot reaſonably be thought that thoſe men who would freely lay down their lives to preſerve the *Bible*, would not have done the like in teſtimony of their belief that *Chriſt is God and Man, was crucified, &c.* or that they would not rather have ſuffered death, than have left *off Preaching the Word*, and *Adminiſtring* the *Holy Sacraments*.

But further, and more particularly thus; *Chriſts Doctrine* conſiſts of *Credenda* and *Agenda*, which the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts*, before they were committed to *Writing*, and after alſo, *Orally* taught to *multitudes* of people, who *cordially* embrac'd them, being fully perſwaded that their own and their Poſterities *eternal welfare* depended on the *Belief* and *Practice* of them. So long therefore as the *ſame Motives* which ſo inclin'd theſe *primitive Chri-*

Chriſtians ſhall remain among men and *affect* them, (which will be as was ſhewn Section 7. to the worlds end) ſo long there ſhall be *teaching*, *learning*, and *practiſing* the *Neceſſaries* to *Salvation* compos'd of the *Credenda* and *Agenda* of the *Goſpel*. The former of which, if they be as *few* as many tell us they are, (*viz.* thoſe compris'd within the *Apoſtolical Creed*) undoubtedly might with eaſe have been *orally* tranſmitted from *Age* to *Age* till now, and may be ſo, while the world laſts. As for the *Agenda*, or *Things of neceſſary practice*, the *Lords Prayer*, and our *Duty* towards *God* and *Man*, comprehended chiefly in the *Ten Commandments*, they are not much more difficult to be learned and kept in mind. Add to theſe the *Sacraments*, the continual *celebration* of which *perpetuates* them, and we have (by the conſent of the *Scripturiſts*) the *ſubſtance* of *Chriſtianity*. But admit the *Credenda* and *Agenda*, which ought *explicitly* to be *believ'd* and *duly practis'd*, were as many more, yet would ſo ſmall a *Catechiſm* contain them *all*, as *Children* and the *vulgar* ſort might generally, without much

much labour, be taught. That the *Neceſſaries* therefore to *Salvation* ſhould ever fail to be *practically* tranſmitted from *Generation* to *Generation* is a-like impoſſible; as that *multitudes* of people ſhould not in *every Age* be *truly* deſirous of their *own*, and their *Poſterities everlaſting Happineſs*, ſeeing (as I have ſhew'd) 'tis a thing *eaſie* and *neceſſary* to *Salvation* to be perform'd, to perpetuate *Chriſts Doctrine* by a continued practical *delivery* of it, till the Conſummation of all things.

However clear the truth of this may ſeem, yet in regard I meet with four grand *Arguments* urg'd ſtiffly againſt the *indefectibility* of *Tradition*, two of which are thought (by ſome) to be grounded on firm *Reaſon*; the other two on certain *Experience*; 'twill be requiſite well to conſider of them, and to try their ſtrength.

The firſt is, That *Moral Cauſes work not neceſſarily, and therefore it cannot be certainly concluded that however ſtrongly the Motives for the practical continuance of Chriſts Doctrine be apply'd to the mind, the Will will undoubtedly embrace them, and act according to them.* This firſt *Argument* is ſuffi-

ſufficiently (I think) anſwer'd, Sect. 7. yet for fuller conviction I will add this here, that the ſame *Argument* if appli'd to *Scripture*, would prove as much every jot againſt *Scriptures preſervation*, as againſt the *continuance of Tradition*. If it be repli'd that *Gods Goodneſs* is engag'd for the *preſervation of Scripture*; I grant it, if man uſe his *own* endeavours, otherwiſe, *God* is not (I conceive) concern'd to preſerve it; for I preſume no man of ſound Reaſon will ſay, that *God* is oblig'd by his Goodneſs immediately to ſave it *Himſelf*, or to commit the ſafeguard of it to the *ſole* care of *Angels*, when *Men*, whoſe *concern* it is to preſerve it, are ſufficient (if there be no default in themſelves) for the work. If Mans endeavours therefore for the conſervation of it be *free* in that ſence which the Objection ſuppoſes *every* action of Man to be, there will be no more certainty of the continuance of *Scripture* than of the practical Delivery of *Chriſts Doctrine* throughout all Generations.

The Second Argument to prove, That *Tradition* is not of an *indefectible* nature

is

is this; *If men be not free, it is no virtue at all in them to be wrought upon by Moral Motives; for what virtue can it be in any man to entertain the Christian Doctrine, and adhere to it whether he will or no, as every one doth whom Moral Motives necessarily move thereunto?* I willingly grant, it is no virtue in any man to do a thing whether he will or no; for to do a thing whether a man will or no, is (according to the common use of the Phrase) to do it *against his Will*, which as to the *actus elicitus* of the *Will*, involves this manifest Contradiction, to *will* or *nill* at *once* the *same* thing. The words therefore, *whether he will or no*, must be interpreted, to mean, here in the Objection, no more than *necessarily*, or rather, in propriety of Speech, *certainly*; for, I take a *necessary* effect in the most strict and proper notion of it, to be an effect wrought in a Subject wholly *passive*; whereas the *Will* is an *active Principle*, and always *determines* it self, however powerfully the *Motives* work upon it. Whence it is, that even the blessed *Saints* and *Angels* in Heaven, though their affections be most strongly and un-

alterably fix'd on *God*, are not neceſſitated thereto without their *own great good-liking*, and *active* tendency to the enjoyment of their *Soveraign Good*. If then the *fruition* of the very *End*, be ſo voluntary, that the *Will* is *active* therein, 'tis certainly ſo, in reſpect of the *Means* conducing to it, to the choice whereof, *deliberation* is prerequir'd; the office of which deliberation, is to conſult *what means* will be moſt available to obtain the deſign'd *End* by; the *principal* of which in *Morals*, is Mans *Summum Bonum*, or *Soveraign Good*, namely, the *fruition* of *God*, whereunto as well the *Moral* as *Theological Virtues* are conducible *Means*; ſo that to be *actually virtuous*, is to act for the enjoyment of the *Chief Good*, in a way *proper* for the attaining of it; which to do the more ſtedfaſtly, conſtantly, and certainly, were not, I ſhould think, to do leſs, but rather more virtuouſly, yet without infringing the *Liberty* of the *Will*, which retains always it's *native* power, when it ſo likes, to do *otherwiſe*. But in caſe the *habit* of *Virtue* in any man grow ſo ſtrong and potent, that it perpetually inclines him

him to purſue his *Chief Good*, I hope, the enjoyment of *God*, will not be made ſuch a neceſſary effect thereby, as that he'l enjoy *God*, whether *himſelf* will or no. The *certainty* therefore of a thing wrought by *Moral Cauſes*, is no evidence that Man is not endued with *Free-will*, but only ſhews that the *Motives* act ſo vigorouſly and powerfully conſidering the preſent diſpoſition of the Mind, and the Circumſtances a man is in, that the *Wills native indifferency* to *will* or *not* to *will*, is caſt by them on that ſide, which makes for producing the *Effect*, but yet ſo, that it's the *Wills* own *choice* to do it, which determines *it ſelf* by reaſon of the preſent agreeableneſs and gratefulneſs of the *Motives* thereunto. For unleſs we'l deny the conſtant Experience of all Ages, we muſt needs confeſs, that there is a *certainty* of divers Effects in the courſe of ſeveral things in the world (ſuch as were mentioned *Sect.* 7. beſides many more not ſpoken of) which flows from *Moral Motives*; ſo that it would be more tolerable, if there were no way to reconcile *Free-will*, and that *certainty*, to make

doubt of the *former*, rather than of the *latter*; but we see, by what has been said, That a *certainty* of *effects* proceeding from *Moral Causes*, and the *native Liberty* of *Mans Will* may well enough consist together.

The *other two* Arguments brought to prove, That *Tradition is defectible*, are Founded on *two Instances*, the former of which is this; *The Tradition of the one true God was in a short time so defac'd and corrupted, that the world did lapse into Polytheism and Idolatry, although it was setled in the heart of* Noah, *and firmly believ'd by him to be the way to Happiness, and the contradicting and deserting this to be the way to Misery; and this Doctrine according to the Traditionists, must be suppos'd, to have been so taught to his children, and by them also to their Posterity.* To this I answer, *first*, that there is not the like reason why a *Doctrine* committed only to *three Families*, should be so permanent, as that which is entrusted to *millions* of people, albeit the *Motives* for the preservation of it were the *same*. But I secondly answer, that the *Motives* for propagating *Christianity* are far more *excellent*, than the *Motives* which

which *Noah* and his *Sons* had for the continuing the belief of the *one true God*. For the *expreſs motives* in ancient time, both before, and under the *Law*, were only *temporal rewards* and *puniſhments*, which becauſe they were ſeen to befal the *bad* and *good* promiſcuouſly; in that ſome of both ſorts abounded with *Riches* and *Honour*, and others had their *afflictions*; 'tis obvious to conceive, conſidering the frequent tentations to Ambition, Luxury, and Avarice, that men would be far leſs intent to regard *Truth*, and exerciſe acts of *Piety* and *Virtue*, when *Everlaſting Bliſs* and *Miſery* were only gather'd by Conſequence to be the final Portion of *good* and *evil* men; than when in *expreſs* words they were conſtantly preſs'd, and inculcated as *Motives*, the one to incline men to embrace *Truth* and *Goodneſs*; the other, to deterr them from *Error* and *Vice*, as ſince the Preaching of *Chriſt's Goſpel* they have ever been. Neither, which I *thirdly*, and laſtly Anſwer, will it be granted, That the *Tradition* of the *one true God* ever fail'd, or was totally loſt, till it appear that *Abraham* and *Lot*, had not know-

ledge of *Him* from *Sem*, or some of his *Progeny*. Could *Abraham* (saith Dr. *Stillingfleet*, *Origin. Sacr. Book* 2. *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 9.) when he was contemporary with *Sem*, be ignorant of the Truth of the Flood, when *Sem*, from whom he deriv'd himself, was one of the Persons who escap'd it in the *Ark*? Could *Sem* be ignorant of the actions before the Flood, when *Adam*, the first Man, lived some part of his time with *Noah*? and could *Noah* then be ignorant of the *Creation*, and *Fall* of *Man*? The same Learned *Author* in the same *Sect.* a little before, writeth thus; *Adam* conversed some time with *Noah*; *Sem* his Son, was probably living in some part of *Jacobs* time, or *Isaacs* at least; and how easily, and *uninterruptedly* might the general *Tradition* of the ancient *History*, be continued thence to the time of *Moses*, when the number of Families agreeing in this *Tradition* was increas'd, and withal incorporated by a common ligament of *Religion*? I demand then (saith the Doctor) where can we suppose any ignorance, or cutting off this *General Tradition*, in so *continued* a *Succession* as here was? The

The latter *Inſtance* offer'd to diſprove the *Indefectibility* of *Tradition* by, is about the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which the *Latin Church* (ſaith the Objection) affirms, is from the *Father*, and the *Son*, and a *neceſſary Article* of *Faith*; the *Greek Church* holding, That he proceeds only from the *Father*, and not from the *Son*, diſowning any ſuch *Doctrine* to have been deliver'd to them by the *precedent Age*, or to any *other Age* of their *Church*, as the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*; and yet no queſtion can be made, but that if the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Spirit* from the *Father* and the *Son*, be an *Article of Faith*, it was taught in the *Greek*, as well as in the *Latin Church*; and therefore the *Nonbelief* of it in the *Greek Church*, is an evident *Argument* of the *actual failure* of *Tradition* in *this Point*, and of the *poſſibility* of it's failings in *others* alſo.

To this, I return, That ſeeing the *Doctrine* of the *Bleſſed Trinity*, and more eſpecially of the *Holy Ghoſt* was purpoſely handled in the *Second General Council* held at *Conſtantinople*, which was principally call'd for confuting and condemning

the *Macedonians*, who deny'd the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and that nevertheleſs, no mention is made in the *Creed* there, ſet forth of his *proceſſion*, ſave from the *Father*, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον: and that alſo the ſame *Creed* was not only receiv'd but continued likewiſe a long time after in the *Latin Church*, without the addition of καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, it ſeems ſtrongly probable (at leaſt) that the *proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son*, was not thought by the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* to be an *Article* of *Catholick Faith*, ſeeing it was ſo obvious, ſo eaſie, and one would think ſo opportune alſo, after ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς to have added καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, if they had indeed believ'd it to be an *Article* of *Faith*. The excuſe that ſome make why they did it not, which is, that there was none as yet who denyed the *proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son*, ſeems trivial, ſince it was the very *Divinity* of the *Holy Spirit* that *Macedonius* oppos'd, which *alone* therefore, if the excuſe were good, ſhould have been aſſerted by the *Council*, and the *contrary opinion* thereto only condemned. But whatever was the cauſe or the occa-

ſion

ſion why καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ was omitted, (which I wave) this is certain that the *Doctrine* of the *Holy Ghoſt*'s *proceſſion* from the *Son*, is either an *Article* of *Catholick Faith*, or it is not; if it be not, *Tradition* is no way concern'd, let the *Greeks* and *Latins* too hold whether way they pleaſe about it. If it be an *Article* of *Faith*, and that the *Greek* and *Latin Churches* agree in the *ſubſtance* and *ſence* of it, and differ only in the manner of the *expreſſion*, there has been no *failure* of *Tradition* in the *Greek Church* concerning the *proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*. Foraſmuch then as it remains only to be known, whether the *Greeks* and *Latins* agree in *Sence*, though they differ in *words*, or the *Greeks* διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, *per filium*, be the ſame in effect with the *Latins* ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, *à Filio*, let's ſee what the *Roman Doctors* (who we may be ſure will be no more favourable to the *Greeks* than's fitting) ſay to't. *Peter Lombard*, writing of the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Father* and the *Son*, ſaith; *Sciendum eſt quòd* Græci *confitentur Spiritum Sanctum eſſe Filii ſicut & Patris, quia & Apoſtolus dicit Spiritum Filii, &*

Veri-

Veritas in Evangelio Spiritum Veritatis. Sed cùm non sit aliud Spiritum Sanctum esse Patris vel Filii, quàm esse à Patre & Filio, etiam in hoc in eandem nobiscum Fidei sententiam convenire videntur, licet in verbis dissentiant. Unde etiam quidam eorum Catholici Doctores intelligentes unam eandémque fore sententiam prædictorum verborum, quibus dicitur Spiritus Sanctus procedere à Filio & esse Filii, professi sunt Spiritum Sanctum etiam procedere à Filio, Lib. 1. *sentent. distinct.* 11. *D. E.* Where the same *Author* goes on, to shew, That several eminent *Greek Fathers*, *Athanasius*, *Didymus*, *Cyrillus*, and *Chrysostom* accord even in *expressions* also about the *Procession* of the *Holy Ghost*. *Aquinas* propounding the Question, *Utrùm Spiritus Sanctus procedat à Patre per Filium*, concludes *affirmatively*, and answers *Objections* made to the contrary, as is to be seen *Part prim. Quæst.* 36. *Artic.* 3. Yea, and Mr. *White*, however in the *Apologie* for *Tradition*, he calls the *Greeks* assertion, concerning the *Holy Ghosts Procession*, (as is truly said of him) a meer *negative Tradition*, or a *Denial* that they have any such *Tradition*, that

that the *Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son*; yet, explicating elsewhere, the *ſacred myſtery* of the *Bleſſed Trinity*, averrs it to be a more ſignificant Speech to ſay, that the *Holy Ghoſt* proceeds from the *Father by* the *Son*, than *from* the *Father* and the *Son*, which in illuſtrating the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* by *Cognitum*, *Cognitio & Amor*, he thus ſhews; *Patet vim motivam quæ eſt in Bono cognito, eſſe totam in ratione Boni, rationem verò cognitionis non eſſe, niſi conjunctionem hujus virtutis ad movendum; quare alio modo dicitur tertia Perſona Procedere à Patre, & alio modo à Filio; & quaſi directè & principaliter à Patre, & à Filio, non niſi concomitanter ſeu tanquam à modo Cauſæ. Unde non mirum, ſi Chriſtus Dominus, & aliqui Patres diſertè dicant eum procedere à Patre, ſine mentione Filii; unde intelligitur, quòd ſit magis expreſſiva locutio dicere, quòd procedit à Patre per Filium, quàm quòd procedit à Patre & Filio. Cùm enim per quaſi viam, & medium denotet, impoſſibile eſt procedere per Filium, & non à Filio, quia omnis pars viæ reſpectu termini, habet rationem termini à quo & principii, unde ly*

per

per explicat & esse à, & à non primo principio.

SECT. XI.

What rational assurance we have, That Scripture is not corrupted in necessaries to salvation. The way to know what things have been ever Orally taught. Two Reasons given, why Tradition, though it be of an indefectible nature, should not be the Rule of Faith. *Whether a fundamental Error, can ever obtain a* setled *quiet possession in the visible Church? An offer from Reason, for the impossibility of the thing. Errors not fundamental may overspread the Church, and why. Several instances of such Errors in the* Roman *Church.*

THE *practical delivery* of *Christs Doctrine* never (as has been seen) *failing*; it may by carefully searching the *Scri-*

Scripture, be known, *what things* contain'd in it are of *neceſſity* to be *generally believ'd* and *practis'd* (becauſe no more is ſo, but what has been *always believ'd*, and *practis'd* by *Chriſtians*) provided aſſurance may be had, *what* has been *ever practically deliver'd*; and that *Scripture* is not corrupted in ſuch places of it, as contain the *Neceſſaries* to *ſalvation*, or *Articles* of *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Faith*.

For the *latter*, (which I'le firſt inſiſt on) That *Scripture* is not corrupted in *neceſſary Points*, I ſhall briefly ſay but this; Since the *actings* of Gods Providence are not known to us but as they are ſeen in *ſecond Cauſes*, the moſt rational account we have, That *Scripture* is come ſafe to our hands, without *Corruption in all things of neceſſity to be generally believ'd, and practis'd*, is from hence; that *Scripture* being conſtantly read by multitudes of *Knowing Chriſtians*, could not poſſibly be corrupted in *Texts* containing ſuch things as were perpetually *taught*, *repeated*, and *practis'd* in the *Church* (of which ſort the *Neceſſaries* to *Salvation* are) without being taken notice of, and if occaſion requir'd, *rectified*. As

As for satisfaction in the other difficulty, *viz. What things have been ever Orally taught*, this in general, from what has been said, appears certain, that *no Point of Christ's Doctrine* shall *ever fail*. And although in this or that Place, the continuance of *Christian Faith* be not *necessary*, yet where ever there has been a visible great *Society* of *Christians*, wherein it was once *firmly* setled, and which has had a constant succession of *Pastors* continued in it, *nothing* held by that *Society* to be an *Article* of *Faith*, could *totally* cease to be so esteem'd, unless so vast a *Body* (in which there would be in every Age a considerable number of *wise* and *pious* men) could either be *universally* impos'd on by fraud, or forc'd by violence; or that *all* it's *Members* would carelesly neglect, or wilfully forsake, what they believ'd to be a necessary Means to save themselves, and their Posterity from *endless Torment*, and to bring them to *everlasting Joy*. *Universally* then such a Body could neither desert, nor lose it's *Faith*, in any *necessary Point*. And in case any *remarkable* member, or part thereof, should ever do it,

'twould

'twould be known, and presently oppos'd by the sound Part adhering to the *Truth*, as constant *Experience* has made evident in the timely resisting of *all Heresies*. This, if granted to be true, plain reason will enforce our assent, that the *Latin*, or *Western Church*, being such a Society, as is before mention'd, did at the beginning of the *Reformation*, and still does hold and maintain *all the Articles* of *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith* practically transmitted to her.

Objection; If the *Latin*, or *Western Church*, when the Reformation begun, did really hold *all the Articles of Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, by virtue of *Oral Tradition* communicating the same unto it; what good cause can be shewn, why *Tradition* should not be the *Rule of Faith*, even without having the *Doctrines* it delivers confirm'd by parallel Texts of *Holy Writ*?

Answ. Since the *Rule of Faith* must doubtless be that, into which it is ultimately resolv'd, as the *best* and *highest means* of ascertaining *Christs Doctrine* to Mankind; and that the *same* must contain

in

in it no Error; this Inference (I think) will be clear; that in case *Oral Tradition*, or the *Living voice of the Church*, either be not the *best* and *highest means* whereby to ascertain *Christs Doctrine* to Mankind; or that it may deliver, or teach an Error under the notion of an *Article* of *Faith*, it cannot be in justice esteem'd the *Rule of Faith*. And that *Oral Tradition*, or the *Living voice of the Church*, is not the *best* and *highest means* whereby to ascertain *Christs Doctrine* to mankind, the following *Paragraph* (I think) will make good.

Where *two Testimonies* both averr and attest the *same thing*; if the *one* be of *Divine*, the *other* but of *Humane Authority*; the *Testimony* that is *Divine* ought of *Right* to have the *preeminence*, and the *relyance* for the *verity* of what is witnessed by them, is to be *ultimately* cast upon it. Seeing then the *Testimony* of *Scripture* is *Divine*, as being, *ex confesso*, the *Word of God*; and *Tradition* but an *Humane Witness*, forasmuch as it is said to be the Delivery of *Christs Doctrine* in the various expressions of *Pastors*, *Parents*, *Tutors*, *Masters*

of

of *Families*, and *Nurſes*, 'tis moſt reaſonable, that Faith ſhould be *finally* reſolved into Scripture, (and not into *Tradition*) as it's *Rule*. Yea and albeit *Tradition* may peradventure in *ſome* things be thought more plain than *Scripture*; (as for example, ſuppoſe in the Point of *Chriſts Divinity*, theſe words of the *Nicene Creed*; *Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero*; *genitum non factum, conſubſtantialem Patri per quem omnia facta ſunt*;) yet that *Scripture* ſhould be ſtill eſteem'd the *Text*, and *Tradition* but the *beſt*, and *moſt certain Comment* upon it, I gather from hence, That it cannot well be otherwiſe thought, but that even the *Diſciples* of the *Apoſtles* after the *Books* of the *New Teſtament were publiſh'd* and receiv'd among *Chriſtians*, would themſelves confirm to their *Auditors*, what they told them they had been *Orally* taught by the *Apoſtles*, out of the *Written Word*; becauſe the *very Sayings* of *Chriſt himſelf*, and his *divinely inſpir'd Apoſtles*, would in common prudence be thought to be of greater *weight* and *authority* with them, than their *own*, although

believ'd to be eſteem'd by the people, as true and certain, as any whatſoever not of more than *Humane Authority.*

Having found then (I ſuppoſe) one reaſon, why *Tradition* ought not to be held the *Rule of Faith*; I'le make tryal if in another ſenſe alſo, it be not incapable of being juſtly ſo reputed; for if the *preſent Church* of any one Age, can teach us an *Article of Faith* what is not ſo, but indeed an *Error*; then is not *Tradition* the *Rule of Faith.* Now to find out, whether the *Church*, in any one Age, can do ſo, or not, this will be a ſure way; to try, if diſcovery can be made; That any *Error* has been ever taught by the *Catholick Church*, or by any known, and acknowledg'd *Part* of it, as an *Article of Faith*; for if that can be done, the *poſſibility* of the thing, is put out of doubt thereby.

To make a clear diſcourſe on this ſubject, 'twill be expedient to conſider, That there be *two* ſorts of *Errors* in *Matters* of *Religion*; *Fundamental*, and *not-Fundamental.* By *Fundamental*, I mean, ſuch as either *immediately* and *directly*, or, at leaſt, by *neceſſary* and *apparent* Conſequence,

quence, contradict some *Articles* of *Catholick Faith*; by *not-Fundamental*, I mean, such as *evidently* do *neither*. This *Distinction* premis'd, and allow'd of; since 'tis clear (as I take it) by what has been said of the *Motives* and *Means* of perpetuating *Christs Doctrine* in the World, that no *Article* of *Catholick Faith* can ever *perish* or *cease* to be *believ'd*; 'twill follow, that no *Fundamental Error* can at any time get a *setled* and *quiet possession* in the *Church*, but shall always, after it is taken notice of, find *opposition* by *Orthodox Christians*, because they cannot chuse but see, that the *embracing* of it would necessarily destroy the *contrary Divine Truth* firmly held (by so many, at least, as rightly consider the matter) to be *necessary* to *Salvation*. Of the assured certainty of this, we have a famous *Instance* in the *Arian Heresie*, which though eagerly promoted by the *Wit* and *Industry* of most *cunning* and *restless Hereticks*, and stifly back'd and countenanc'd by the *Authority* of several great *Prelats*, assisted with the *might* and *power* of *Temporal Potentates* and *Princes*; yet was still *oppos'd*; and when *fraudulent*

and *violent means* had tir'd and ſpent themſelves, the *oppoſite truth* prevail'd, and ſhew'd it ſelf more glorious than before. But as for *Errors not-Fundamental*, or whoſe *oppoſition* to any *Article of Faith* is not ſeen, becauſe too *remotely* contradictory thereto to be eaſily diſcern'd; if *ſuch* once come to be receiv'd as *pious Opinions*, and promoted by the *Schoolmen*, I do not underſtand, why they may not in long continuance of time, be advanc'd to the *repute* of being eſteem'd *Articles* of *Faith*. For proof of the truth of which, I'le produce ſome few *Inſtances* in the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*.

The *firſt* ſhall be this, That the *Council* of *Trent* has *defin'd Seſs.* 7. *Can.* 9. That there is a *Character*, or *certain ſpiritual ſign*, or *mark imprinted in the ſouls of all that are Baptiz'd, Confirm'd*, and *Ordain'd*, which yet I find diſprov'd by an eminently Learned Gentleman of the *Romiſh Church*, (if I underſtand the *Council* and *Him* aright) in his *Inſtitut. Sacr. Tom.* 2. *Lect.* 4. *pag.* 32. as was ſhewn before in *Sect.* 4. of this *Treatiſe*, and ſo ſuperfluous to be here again ſet down.

A

A *second* Inſtance, is the *Belief of freeing ſouls from Purgatory, and bringing them thence to Heaven before the day of Judgment.* which Opinion, the laſt mentioned *Author*, *Thomas Albius* in his *Book*, *De medio animarum ſtatu*, has prov'd to be *erroneous.* 'Tis true indeed, he ſays, That it is no *Article* of the *Roman Faith*; and I find the *Trent Council*, in *diſertis verbis*, to affirm only this, *Purgatorium eſſe, animáſque ibi detentas fidelium ſuffragiis, potiſſimùm verò acceptabili Altaris Sacrificio juvari. Decret. de Purgatorio, Seſſ.* 25. But the *Popes* granting *Indulgences*, and *Privileg'd Altars*, *Prieſts* ſaying of *Maſſes*, and the *Peoples praying*, and *giving Alms* for the *delivery* of *ſouls* out of *Purgatory*, ſhould better (an indifferent perſon would be apt to think) expound and declare the *Churches ſenſe*, (or *intention* of *Paſtors*, *Parents*, *Tutors*, *Maſters* of *Families*, and *Nurſes*) of the word *juvari*, than any *private Doctor* whatſoever. Yea, and if Maſter *Whites Adverſaries* in this *Point* ſhould urge, That there is a *plain practical Tradition* for the truth of the *delivery of ſouls from Purgatory before the day of*

Judgment, by the help of Indulgences, Masses, Prayers, and *Alms*, it would have some difficulty in it to disprove them. For that the *Members* of the *Roman Church*, do not only generally use those things to that end and purpose, but were also taught by the *preceeding Age* to do so, will not (I presume) be deny'd; so that unless they were told by the *Recommenders* of the *Practice*, that it was the *Product* of a *pious Opinion* only grounded on *probability*, (which I cannot conjecture any likelihood of being done by *Pastors*, *Parents*, *Guardians*, *Masters* of *Families*, and *Nurses*, who most commonly, rather press the *necessity* of what they teach, than otherwise) I apprehend not how they should imbrace it, save on the *same Terms* they did other *practical* things of their *Religion* which they judg'd to be of *Catholick use* and *necessity*.

A *third* Instance, shall be the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* which if it necessarily imply a *Contradiction*, is doubtless an Error; and to prove it doth, I will, of many *Arguments* that might be urg'd, make use only of *two*, when I have first

set

ſet down *three* things, which by the *Traditioniſts*, I am ſure, by ſome of them, will be granted to be *all* of them *truths*. The *firſt* is, That *Tranſubſtantiation, is a converſion of the Bread into the Body, and the Wine into the Bloud of Chriſt.* The *ſecond* is, That a *Body hath extenſion*, or *partes extra partes*. The *third* thing is this, That *How many Hoſts, or conſecrated Elements ſoever there be, Chriſts Body is nevertheleſs but one.* Theſe three *Propoſitions* preſuppos'd as true; I argue, That the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* implies a *Contradiction*, in manner following.

Whoſoever teacheth, That one and the ſame Body, may be equally extended, and not equally extended, at one and the ſame time, teacheth in effect, a Contradiction to be true.

But whoſoever teacheth the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, teacheth that one and the ſame Body may be equally extended, and not equally extended at one and the ſame time: *Ergo*,

Whoſoever teacheth the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, teacheth in effect, a Contradiction to be true.

The reason of the *Major* is this; *Corpus & quoquoversus extensum, vel quod habet partes extra partes*, signifie the *same* thing, and to be equally extended, and not equally extended, is one with this, to be extended to one and the same degree, and not be extended to one and the same degree, which to befal one and the same thing, at one and the same time, is certainly *contradictory*; since (in regard a *Body* and a *Thing every way extended* differ not) 'tis in effect to be one and the same thing and not one and the same thing at once, or the same thing not to be the same thing with it self.

The evidence for the truth of the *Minor* is no less than for that of the *Major*; for since according to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, *Christs Body* is every where *one* and the same *Body*, and the *consecrated Elements* are *many*, (either Substances or Accidents) 'twill follow, That as often as the *Elements* are at the same time of *different* sizes or bigness, the *Body* of *Christ*, which is neither *more*, nor *less* extended on the *Altar* than the *Elements*, must be of an *unequal* bigness at the *same* time;

time; or be *equally*, and *not-equally*, or juſt to *ſuch* a *degree*, and not juſt to *ſuch* a *degree* of bigneſs extended in *one* moment of time; For example, The *Body* of *Chriſt* under the *Elements* extended in one place to *two* degrees, and the *ſame Body* under the *Elements* extended in another place to *three* degrees, would be at the ſame time extended juſt to *two* degrees, and *not* juſt to *two* degrees; and likewiſe juſt to *three* degrees, and *not* juſt to *three* degrees, which to ſuppoſe a truth (ſeeing a *Body*, and a *Thing every way extended* is the ſame) were to put a thing to be not the ſame thing which it is.

Another *Argument* is offer'd againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* thus;

To affirm *Chriſts Body* to be *greater* and leſs than it ſelf at the ſame time, is, in effect, to affirm a Contradiction true:

But to affirm *Chriſts Body* to be in two or more diſtinct places at once, (as thoſe who will defend *Tranſubſtantiation* muſt do) is to affirm it to be greater and leſs than it ſelf at the ſame time: *Ergo*,

To affirm *Chriſt Body* to be in two, or more diſtinct places at once, is, in effect, to affirm a Contradiction true. The

The truth of the *Major*, is clear from hence, That it is the same for a Body (or a thing extended) to be greater and less than it self at the same time, as to be, and not to be the same with it self; which is impossible.

And the *Minor* is equally certain, for since two distinct places are of larger extent than one, and that *locus* and *locatum* are *commensurate*; if one body fill distinctly and apart one place, and yet, at the same time, fill another also, it will, of necessity, be greater and less than it self, whilst filling only one place, it will be less than it self filling two; and filling two, it will be greater than it self filling only one.

Some *Romanists* I know will make light of all this I have said against *Transubstantiation*, and think to confute it by flatly denying, that a *Body* and *Thing extended* is all one; but of such I would fain learn, what a *Body* then is, or how a *corporeal* substance, as such, is distinguish'd from an *incorporeal*, a *material* from an *immaterial*, otherways than by *extension*, or having *partes extra partes*, by which it is con-

contiguous to the ſeveral diſtinct ſides of the ambient Body or Bodies that encompaſs it; whereas an *incorporeal* or *immaterial* ſubſtance having no ſuch parts, is of neceſſity *all together* whereſoever it is. If it were ſaid, that a *material* ſubſtance is not of neceſſity *actually* extended, yet *naturally* capable of being ſo, which an *immaterial* is not; I deſire to be reſolv'd, whether by nature, and creation, there be or ever was, any *material ſubſtance* in the world without *extenſion*; if they yield (as I aſſure my ſelf they will) there neither is, nor ever was; I ſhall take their conceſſion for a grant, that it is a *natural* and innate property of *matter* to have *extenſion*; and conſequently from thence inferr, that if *Chriſts Body*, in the *Euchariſt* be *unextended*, 'tis either an *immaterial* ſubſtance, that is, a *Spirit* and no *Body*; or elſe a *new* kind of *Being*, which is neither *material* nor *immaterial*, ſince by *Creation*, all ſubſtances were either the one or the other, had *quantitative* parts, or had *not*. If *reply* were made that *Chriſts Body* is *miraculouſly preſent* in the *Euchariſt* by way of *ſubſtance*, (as *Aquinas* and *others* ſay it

it is) not including *material* nor *immaterial*, but *abſtracting* from *both*; I would *rejoyn*, and ſay, That the *exiſtente* of *ſuch* a *Being* is (to my apprehenſion) *impoſſible*; for although in *Metaphyſicks*, *Philoſophers* ſpeak *abſtractedly*, firſt of a *ſubſtance*, and afterwards difference it by *corporeal* and *incorporeal*; yet ſuch diſcourſe doth not at all intend or ſuppoſe, that there either is, or can be, a *ſubſtance* really *exiſting*, which is neither of the *two*; no more than from ſaying *animal eſt rationale, vel irrationale*, it can be preſum'd, that an *animal* doth or may poſſibly *exiſt* and be neither *man* nor *brute*. The deſign of inventing ſuch general words as *ſubſtantia*, *animal*, *homo*, was not to make *ſigns* of any *real* or *poſſible* Being to be ſignified by them, but to *contract* and *abbreviate* mens diſcourſe for the more *ready* underſtanding of one another; as for Inſtance, when we would ſignifie in ſhort, that *Peter*, *James*, *John*, and *every other individual* perſon in the world is of the *ſame nature*, to wit, a *creature compounded of ſoul and body endued with ſenſe and reaſon*, a word is fram'd to *comprehend* and *import*

all

all that, which is, *Homo*, *Man*; and then we affirm of *Peter*, of *James*, of *John*, &c. that he is a *Man* inſtead of ſaying he is a *Creature compounded of Soul and Body, endued with Senſe and Reaſon.* When again it is obſerv'd wherein *Peter*, *James*, *John*, &c. agree with *every ſingular Brute*, a word is devis'd to *denote* that *agreement*, to wit, *animal.* And ſince it is found that not only all theſe, but that alſo *every corporeal* and *ſpiritual Thing* whatſoever accords together in this, that they have a *Being ſubſiſting of it ſelf*, a word is us'd to ſhew that, which is *ſubſtantia* a *ſubſtance*; to avoid therefore the trouble of ſaying, *Peter*, *James*, *John*, &c. *this horſe*, *bird*, *fiſh*, &c. is *a Thing that has a Being of it ſelf*, we contract it into this, *Peter*, *James*, &c. *this horſe*, *bird*, *fiſh* is a *ſubſtance*; ſince then we ſee, that a Subſtance *abſtractedly* taken, is not only *void*, but even *incapable* of *all* kind of *exiſtence*, to ſay, *Chriſts Body* is preſent in the *bleſſed Sacrament* after the *manner* of a *Subſtance*, is to the ſame effect, as to ſay, That it is neither *corporeally*, nor *incorporeally* there preſent, that is, in verity not at all. But

ſup-

ſuppoſe we that *Chriſts Body* were preſent in the *Euchariſt* without *extenſion*, and no other ſubſtance for the *Accidents* of Bread and Wine to *ſubſiſt* in; the *Accidents*, in ſuch a caſe, muſt either ſubſiſt in *Chriſts Body*, and ſo *extenſion* be in a *Subject unextended*, which is plainly *contradictory*; or elſe, they muſt ſubſiſt of *themſelves* without a *Subject*, which is equally *impoſſible*; for if we duly reflect, we ſhall find, That an *Accident* is not any *Thing* really differing from it's *Subject*, but a *meer Mode* only, or *manner* of it's *Being*, or an *appearance* of the *Subject*, under ſome *particular* conſideration, as will (I think) by the following Inſtance evidently be ſeen; Take a piece of *Paſte*, and mold it into ſeveral *forms* one after another, making it now *long*, then *round*, afterward *ſquare*, and 'twill be no *thing* all the while, but the very *ſame Paſte* ſtill, under various *appearances*, which for *diſtinction* ſake, we give different *appellations* to; ſo that to ſuppoſe *length*, *roundneſs*, *ſquareneſs*, (or *long*, *round*, *ſquare*, take whether we pleaſe) really to *exiſt*, without ſome *Thing* which we denominate

nate *long*, *round*, *square*, is to suppose the *meer mode* of a *Thing*, not to be the *meer mode* of a *Thing*, but a *Thing* of it *self*, which is utterly *impossible*. Many strange *incredible* things beside would follow, upon the supposal of the *Accidents* subsisting without a *Subject*, as that *they* are apt to do and suffer all things, which the *Bread* and *Wine* before their Transubstantiation were liable unto; as to nourish the Body, to be broken, to be spilt, to be corrupted, to be turn'd into ashes, smoke, *&c.* which seem to involve in them a *contradiction* also, in that a *meer accident*, which is *nothing* of it self should do and suffer *something* of its self.

SECT.

SECT. XII.

That the Holy Scripture, or *Written Word of God, is the Rule of Christian Faith. That Tradition is the best, and safest way and means, whereby to attain to the certain knowledge thereof. That the Multitude, or weakest sort of Christians are not able of themselves, without the help of others, to resolve Faith aright, or be rationally assur'd, what the Doctrine of Salvation is.*

NOW at length having master'd all the difficulties in my Way; I see nothing of moment to obstruct or hinder me, why I may not from the premis'd Discourse securely inferr, That the *Sacred Scripture,* (i.e. *Such places* of it as *contain* the *necessariò credenda,* and *agenda* of *Christs Gospel*) is the *Rule of Christian Faith*; yet so, as that without the help of *Tradition,* it cannot be known to be the *Word of God*; nor when, in general, 'tis known

known so to be, any such *rational* assurance can be had, That the *Texts* containing the *Necessaries* to *Salvation*, remain *uncorrupt*, as from *Tradition*; nor lastly, that those *Necessaries* to *Salvation*, can be manifested what they are, save as *Tradition* guides unto, and gives notice of them. All which, if I have been right in the proof of, in *Sect.* 7, 9, 10, 11. he that goes about to seek for the *Rule* of *Faith* and makes not *Tradition* his *chief* and *best assistant*, shall never have any *rational* ground of *certainty*, that he has met with it, and *explicitly* knows the *Contents* of it, even though perchance he have really and indeed found it, and peradventure *explicitly* believes whatsoever is contain'd in it.

If it be so difficult a thing, as it seems to be, by what hath been said, to *resolve Faith* aright, or to make such use of *Scripture*, as to be *certainly* inform'd by it of *Christs Doctrine*, without danger of *erring* or being *mistaken*, it might be demanded, how the *generality* of *Christians* should be able of *themselves* to do it? True, but such demand, as it would be reasonable

and pertinent, if the *Multitude* were oblig'd to learn the *Chriſtian Religion* of *themſelves*, *immediately* from *Scripture*; ſo on the contrary, if they have no obligation to do it, 'tis neither the one, nor the other. And that no ſuch obligation lies upon them, the *unpracticableneſs* (to ſay no worſe) of the thing, manifeſted in the *Sixth Section* of this *Treatiſe*, ſufficiently teſtifies. We muſt then, would ſome ſay, *pin* (it ſeems) our *Faith* on *others ſleeves*. To wave that *catachreſtical* effeminate ſpeech, let's put the *Queſtion* more manlike and fairly thus, Whether the *generality* of the People muſt not of neceſſity rely on *others Learning* and *Fidelity*, in coming to the *knowledge* of *Chriſts Doctrine*; And my *Anſwer* then is, That there is no poſſible way of avoiding it without a continued *Miracle* of *immediate Revelation*, but that, moſt certainly they muſt, and 'twas and ever will be ſo. For *firſt*, if we look back towards the beginning of the *Goſpel*, we ſhall find that the *New Teſtament* was writ by the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* in *Greek*, which *Tongue*, though granted to have been the moſt

moſt generally known of any *one*, then in the *Eaſtern parts*; yet, that every *third Chriſtian* underſtood that *Language*, is not at all to be thought on. *Secondly*, Nor was the *Scripture* preſently *Tranſlated* into every *Tongue*, where there were thoſe who imbrac'd *Chriſtianity*. *Thirdly*, Neither could poor *Mechanicks*, *Labourers*, *Servants*, and *Slaves* procure it, when *Tranſlated*, before the ready way of *Printing* was Invented; becauſe, 'twas not formerly a little money that would buy both, or even one of the *Teſtaments*. *Fourthly*, Neither yet, if *all Chriſtians* had had wherewith to buy, would there have been, till the *Art* of *Printing* was found, *Books* enough for half, or a quarter of them. *Fifthly*, Suppoſe we now, that by means of the *Preſs*, every one has, or might have, a *Bible* in their *native Tongue*; How is it poſſible, that the *vulgar* ſhould know of *themſelves* that it is the *Word* of *God*? that it has been kept free from *corruption* in things of *neceſſary Belief* and *Practice*? that it is *faithfully* Tranſlated out of the *Originals*? that conſidering what variety of *Doctrines* are in it, and in

how many places dispers'd, they should be able, and at leisure, to cull out of it a *Summary* of *Fundamentals*, (in case the thing it self were attainable without other helps beside *Scripture*) seeing *millions* of them are necessitated to spend their whole time almost, to get a poor *Livelihood* for themselves and Families? that they should be able to compare places of *Scripture* so effectually, as rightly to compose *seeming Contradictions* in *Points* of *Faith*, thereby, when not without difficulty they are got to understand, but ordinarily well, even plain and common things? Who so shall seriously reflect on these matters, will doubtless think it strangely unbecoming Mans most *gracious Maker*, and *Redeemer*, to require at the hands of the *poor ignorant* people to pick out their *Religion* of *themselves* from *Holy Scripture*, or to depend upon their own *weak* performances, for finding out the true *sence* and *interpretation* of it. For (over and above what *has* been already shewn for the unreasonableness of the thing) after this be first well weigh'd, in the balance of sound *Reason*, that the *multitude* must of necessity

ty truſt *others*, for the *truth* of the *Tranſlation* of *Scripture*, let an *irrefragable Reaſon* be given by any that can, why they ſhould not as well, and might as ſafely give credit to thoſe for the *ſenſe* of it, who are in *prudence* to be entruſted by reaſon of their *Knowledge* and *Honeſty* for *recommending* to them the *ſincerity* of the *Verſion*, ſince 'tis to be preſum'd they underſtand it to be a *true tranſlation* no further, than they know the *ſence* of the *words tranſlated*. Notwithſtanding the plain verity of what has here been ſaid, 'tis not unknown how frequently and vehemently ſome popular men uſe to cry out to the people from the *Pulpit*, Believe not *us*, believe the *Scripture*, as if the meaneſt of their *Auditors* were thought by them to be the *proper Judges* of the *Scripture ſence*, amongſt the reſt. But though their words ſeem to import as much, if we look to the bottom of the buſineſs, we ſhall diſcover, That even theſe *Preachers* muſt acknowledge, they intend otherwiſe; or elſe confeſs their deſign in doing it is unlawful. For when they ſay, Believe not *us*, believe the *Scri-*

pture; they either intend the *Texts* they quote for a *Proof* of what they *teach*, or they do not. If they intend them for a *Proof*, their meaning muſt be this; believe *us*, yet not for our *own* ſakes, but for the *Scriptures*; that is, believe *us*, becauſe we teach the very *ſame Doctrine* which the *Scripture* doth; or believe the *Scripture* to the *ſame* intent and purpoſe, or in the *ſame* ſenſe we alledge it, for to believe it in any *other*, would not have the effect of a *Proof* with them. But if they have no intention to uſe the *Scriptures* they quote to *prove* what they Preach, let them inform us to what other *good* intent they do it, for I cannot think of any. To ſeveral *bad ends*, 'tis obvious enough to conceive how it may be done; as out of *covetouſneſs*, or through the deſire of *applauſe*, or for promoting a *faction*, to *humour* and *gratifie* the people they Preach unto. But for none of *theſe* ends will they yield, I am well aſſur'd, they do it; and therefore I ſee no way to avoid it, but that the *Quotations* muſt be granted to be produc'd for *Proofs*, and conſequently, that the perſons uſing them have no real de-

deſign by ſaying, believe not *us*, believe the *Scripture*, that the *truth* of their *Doctrine* ſhould ſtand, or fall, accordingly as their *Auditors* judge it conſonant, or diſagreeing to the *places* of *Holy Writ* which they'r directed to, for *examination* and *tryal* of the *verity* of what their *Teachers* deliver, as they themſelves often (I believe) apprehend; but for *Proof* and *confirmation* indeed of the *Doctrine* taught, according to the intendment of the *Preacher*.

Some perhaps would here be encourag'd to aſſert, that this which I have laſt diſcours'd, concerning *Holy Writ*, (*viz.* that the *Multitude* cannot without better help than their own, make right uſe of *Scripture*, as 'tis the *Rule of Faith*) makes for *Oral Tradition*, which inſtructs every one from the *Prince* to the *Peaſant* in all the *Articles* of *Chriſtian Faith*. To ſuch I ſhould anſwer, That *Tradition* could no more be made uſe of as the *Rule of Faith* (ſuppoſing it were ſo) by the People, without the aſſiſtance of ſome more *skilful* than themſelves, than *Scripture* can. For *firſt*, They muſt truſt *others*, that

what they are instructed in by their *immediate* Teachers, is the *sense* of the *present Catholick Church. Secondly*, They must have it from better *Arguments* than themselves can frame, That the *Doctrine* of the *present Church* is the very *same* with the *Doctrine* of the *Church* in all *foregoing Ages* since *Christ. Thirdly*, They must believe *others*, *That Tradition* is the *alone Rule of Faith*, for the *Multitude* (I may safely say) is not so quick sighted, as clearly to see, that there's no *other* way to come to a right knowledge of *Christs Doctrine*, but by an *Oral Delivery* of it. So that in fine, I am much assur'd, That the *Rule of Faith* was never intended by *God* for the *Multitude* to resolve *immediately* of *themselves* the *Christian Faith* into; and that therefore the *Distinction* of *Ecclesia docens, & discens* is good, yea, necessary to be *practically* maintain'd and upheld among *Christians*; To the *former* of which (I mean the *Ecclesia docens*) consisting of *Prelates* and *Pastors*, the *Depositum*, or *Rule of Faith*, is *principally* (not *solely*, because it is lawful for any to make good use of it that can) entrusted; for that in reason,

reaſon, the *Clergy* is juſtly preſum'd to be fitteſt, both for *Skill* and *Will*, to underſtand it *aright*, and to employ it to it's *due End*, whilſt they can want no *Helps* poſſible to be had for gaining the *true ſenſe* of it; and that it is the *Main* of their *Employ*, for which they are called to their *Sacred Office*, to uſe and exerciſe the ſame to it's *proper End*; whereas *others*, generally ſpeaking, neither have the like advantages to underſtand it as it ought to be, nor ſo *great* Motives and Obligation to promote the true *intendment* and *deſign* thereof.

Have not then the People, even every particular perſon of them, it might well be ask'd, a *Judgment* of *Diſcretion* in the choice and matters of *Religion*? If by *Judgment* of *Diſcretion* be meant, That they are to do nothing, but what they themſelves *approve* of; I readily yield they have. But in caſe they ſet themſelves to *oppoſe* their *own* Judgment to the Judgment of the *Clergy* in *Matters* of *Faith*, their *Judgment* will be found a *Judgment* of intolerable and pernicious *Indiſcretion*. For to make a true diſcovery of an *Error* in

in *Faith*, the *Rule of Faith* must be well consulted, and the *Point* in *question* duly *apply'd* to't, to be *try'd* by it; so that if either the *Rule* it self be *mistaken*, or the *Thing* to be *regulated* by it, be not *rightly* apply'd, no *Doctrine* concerning *Faith* can *rationally* be discover'd, whether it be an *Error*, or a *Truth*. And 'tis ridiculously absurd, to think, that the vulgar sort consisting of Servants, Labourers, Mechanicks, and others, generally busied and spending their days about *Temporal* affairs, should be *more* sufficient, and able, to understand the *Rule of Faith* aright, and to apply things doubted of thereto, so as truly to determine of their *rectitude* or *obliquity* by it, than the grave and Learned *Prelates*, with the profound *Doctors*, and *others* of the more *Ancient* and *Reverend Divines*, who have spent many of them *thirty*, several of them *forty*, and some amongst them *fifty* years, or more, in the study (for the most part) of *Sacred Learning*, being legally also call'd to the *Office* of *teaching* and *directing* Mankind as *Christian*, by a *Mission* successively deriv'd from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, which

which none beſides the *Clergy*, how Learned or Pious ſoever, can juſtly make claim to. Would it not then aſtoniſh, and work compaſſion in any man of ſobriety, to ſee the ignorant people groſly miſled to believe, They are able enough of *themſelves* to underſtand the *Scripture*, *in all things neceſſary to Salvation*, when as 'tis *principally* for inſtructing them aright in *thoſe very things*, and keeping them to the due obſervance of *them*, that they have *ſpiritual Guides* and *Governours* ſet over them by *God*, and his *Holy Church*? Which yet they are many of them poor ſouls, being ſtrangely infatuated with a conceit of their own endowments, ſo far from having any regard to, that although they daily ſee before their eyes, That the *wiſe* and *gracious God*, in the *Oeconomy* of his great *Family*, the World, has provided and placed ſeveral men *skill'd* in ſeveral things; ſome in *Civil Government*, ſome in *Laws*, ſome in *Phyſick*, and others in *other Profeſſions*, all for the *Good* of the *Community* in aſſiſting men in thoſe things, wherein they are preſum'd not to have *skill enough* to do the *beſt* for themſelves; yet

yet nevertheleſs, they will not underſtand and diſcern a neceſſity of ſome *skilfuller* than they themſelves be, to adviſe, direct, and order them in thoſe *grand* Matters, which are of more *Weighty* and *laſting* Concern to them, then *all* the things in the whole World beſides; but in contradiction to the *Analogy* of *Providence* ſeen round about them, deſpiſing thoſe, who ought to have the *overſight* of their *Belief* and *Manners*, make *themſelves* their own *Inſtructors* and *Rulers* in the Learning and Management of thoſe things, wherein if they *finally* miſcarry, they are ruin'd to *eternity*.

SECT.

SECT. XIII.

The harm that may arise to the Church, *from the belief of an Error not-Fundamental, to be an Article of Faith. The true stating of the difference, between the Church of* England, *and the Church of* Rome. *Whether or no the Church of* England *be justly accus'd of criminal Schism? That the joynt Concurrence of Scripture, and Oral Tradition, (or the practical Delivery of Christs Doctrine) was recommended by the Apostles to the Church; the Restauration of which Concurrence ('tis humbly conceiv'd) would be a firm Foundation for re-uniting dissenting Christians in Matters of Religion; and the Continuance of it a lasting Means for perpetuating Christianity in its ancient native Purity.*

I Have now only one *Scruple* more remaining concerning *Matters* of *Faith*, and it arises from what my self concluded before, which was, That no *Fundamental Error*

Error could ever get a *setled footing* without disturbance, but should perpetually meet with *opposition* from *Orthodox Christians*, so that *all necessary Truths*, shall be continually nouriſh'd in the *Bosom* of the *visible Church*. In which if I have said right, what *harm*, may it with great appearance of reason be ask'd, can be found to accrue upon it, if an *Error*, *not-Fundamental* chance to creep into the *Church*, and grow by degrees to be held at length an *Article* of *Faith*, seeing the *belief* thereof is not in *its self* destructive of *Salvation*? I answer, there is this great harm in it, if no other, that in case it at any time come to be *discover'd*, and *National Churches* be thereupon divided about it, *one* holding it to be an *Article* of *Faith*, *another* taking it to be an *Erroneous Doctrine*, there will unavoidably a *Schism* happen upon it; because that *Church* which thinks it to be an *Article* of *Faith*, will conceive *herself* oblig'd to deny *Communion* to the *other*, which rejects it as an *Error*; and that *other* which rejects it as an *Error*, must needs judge it to be an *heinous Sin*, to acknowledge

ledge and profeſs that *She* believes a *Doctrine* to be an *Article* of *Faith*, which in truth *ſhe* holds to be an *Erroneous Opinion*; and yet without ſuch acknowledgment, and anſwerable profeſſion, ſhe cannot be admitted to *Communion* with the *Church* that believes it to be an *Article* of *Faith*. Upon this very account it is, that the *Diviſions* between the *Church* of *Rome*, and *Church* of *England*, as to the *Doctrinal Part* of *Religion*, are continued; for I find, that the moſt cautious and wary *Vindicators* of the *Engliſh Church* from the *guilt* of *Schiſm*, which the *Romaniſts* inceſſantly accuſe *her* of, alledge in excuſe for her *Separation*, that the *Church of Rome* requires as *neceſſary Conditions of her Communion, the acknowledgment of ſome erroneous Doctrines to be Articles of Faith, together with a publick profeſſion of them; which Doctrines, although not damnable in their own nature, becauſe not directly repugnant to any Fundamental Truth, (and ſo not neceſſarily inconſiſtent together in the ſame Soul with the ſincere Belief of all things neceſſary to Salvation) yet would become damnable to thoſe, who judging them to be*

Errors,

Errors ſhould atknowledge and profeſs them, contrary to their Judgments, to be Articles of Faith. To this purpoſe writes the learned *Biſhop Montague*, the renowned *Arch-Biſhop Laud*, Dr. *Ferne*, Dr. *Hammond*, the late *Lord Primate* of *Ireland* Biſhop *Bramhal*, with *others*, whereunto I'le add one *Controvertiſt* more, of the preſent time, Doctor *Stillingfleet*, of which two laſt mentioned (not to multiply needleſs *quotations* about a thing ſo well known) I'le here tranſcribe two *Paſſages*; *It was not* (ſaith the learned *Primate*) *the erroneous Opinions of the Church of* Rome, *but the obtruding them by Laws upon other Churches, which warranted a ſeparation.* Biſhop *Bramhal*'s Vindication againſt Mr. *Baxter*, pag. 101. *This is clearly the ſtate of the difference*; (ſaith Doctor *Stillingfleet*) *between the Church of* Rome, *and Church of* England. *The Church of* Rome *impoſeth new Articles of Faith to be believ'd as neceſſary to Salvation, as appears*, &c. *But the Church of* England *makes no Articles of Faith, but ſuch as have the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages, and are acknow-*

knowledg'd to be ſuch by Rome *it ſelf, and in other things ſhe requires ſubſcription, not as Articles of Faith, but as inferiour Truths, which She expects a ſubmiſſion to, in order to her peace and tranquillity.* Thus the ingenious *Doctor* in his *Rational account of the Grounds of Proteſtant Religion, pag.* 54. The *Church* of *England* then by this, holding nothing to be an *Article of Faith*, but what *Rome* it ſelf acknowledges to be *ſo*; it's evident, That if the *Church* of *England* believe all the *Articles* of *Catholick Faith*, as *ſhe* profeſſes *ſhe* doth, the *Church* of *Rome* does likewiſe the ſame; and conſequently, ſince every *Fundamental Truth* is an *Article* of *Catholick Faith*, that *ſhe* believes *all Fundamental Truths*, no leſs than the *other* doth. So that the true and real difference between thoſe two *Churches*, is not about *Fundamentals*, but *Superſtructures*, which if they be *Errors*, or *any* of them, (as I think ſome of them are prov'd to be in *Sect.* 11. and if it were neceſſary, others, I conceive, might be) the *impoſing* of them as *Articles* of *Faith* by the *Romiſh Church* layes the *guilt* of *Schiſm* at *her* door. But that it ever will

be granted by the *Romaniſts*, (while they eſteem either the Definitions of *Popes* or *Councils*, or the *Living Voice* of the *Church* the *Rule* of *Faith*, and hold the *Council* of *Trent* to be a true *Repreſentative* of the *Church*) that they embrace any *Errors* as *Articles* of *Catholick Faith*, is not to be expected. And that they'l yield to change their pretended *Rules* of *Faith*, there's ſmall encouragement yet to hope, ſince 'tis true as well of them, as of too many others, what the rational *Animadverter* upon the Pamphlet entituled, *The naked Truth*, rightly obſerves, That *Polemical Authors commonly oppoſe thoſe paſſages in their Adverſaries Books, which are ready to fall of themſelves, and paſs by thoſe which urge and preſs them harder.* If it were not too truly ſo, 'twould be a matter of great amazement to me, That *Scripture* and Chriſtian *Oral Tradition* ſhould ſtill be cryed up *one* againſt the other, and made to look as if they were at *enmity*, when 'tis manifeſtly clear, that *God* at firſt *joyn'd* them *amicably* together, in that the *Bleſſed Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* recommended the *Holy Goſpel*, or *Revelation* of *Jeſus Chriſt* the

the *Son* of *God*, both in *Writing*, and by an *Oral Delivery*, and *Practical Profeſſion* of it to the World; deſigning them, no doubt, to go hand in hand for Inſtructing, Confirming, and Regulating Men in the *Belief* and *Practice* of *Chriſtianity*, till the end of all things. And therefore till their joynt *Concurrence* for deciding Controverſies of *Faith* be agreed on to be reſtored to the *Church*, I ſee not what great *Good* we can rationally expect by *Diſputation*; whereas, if due reſpect and regard were had to *both*, the Iſſue and Event thereof would (as it appears to me) be this: That *Nothing* father'd on *Scripture* could be aſſented to, and received as a *Catholick Point* of *Faith*, unleſs there were likewiſe found a *Practical Tradition* of it in the *Church*; nor *any Doctrine* be taken and held for a *Catholick Tradition*, but what was evidently ſeen by the *Chief* of the *Clergy* (at leaſt) to have a real Ground in *Holy Writ*; ſo that all private Interpretation of Scripture in *Matters* of *Chriſtian Faith* and *Manners*, would on the one hand be baniſhed from among *Chriſtians*; and the *Living Voice*

of the *Church* would on the other hand teach nothing for a *Divine Revelation*, but what was either to be *expresly* found in *Sacred Writ*, or might *evidently* be deduced from it; whence the *Christian Religion* ('tis humbly conceived) might obtain a certain Way (whensoever *Interest* or *Passion* prevented not) to be secured from *Error*, and the *Church* from *Schism*.

FINIS.

AN

AN APPENDIX Of ſeveral OBJECTIONS TO Certain Things aſſerted in the Preceding *TREATISE*, with their reſpective *ANSWERS*.

To which is added an Explanation *of the different* Acceptations *of the Word* Tradition, *uſed in the ſame.*

Objection I.

THE Author of the *Treatiſe*, Entituled, *The ſeveral ways of Reſolving Faith in the* Roman *and Reformed Churches*, undertakes in *Section 6.* to diſprove the Aſſertion, That all things neceſſary to *Salvation* are *clear* in *Scripture* to every *Underſtanding*; but I think in vain, ſeeing whatever is offered by him in oppoſition thereto, may be juſtly, for ought I ſee

to the contrary, evaded, by saying only, that *no more revealed Truths are necessary to be believed by any sincere and diligent Reader of Sacred Writ, than those only which are clear to his own Understanding.* For on this Account it will be the same thing in respect of *Salvation*, whether a *man* believe *many* Divine Truths, or a *few*, if so be he neglect not the Reading of *Scripture*, and cordially embrace those which he *clearly* understands.

Answer.

Since the Belief mentioned in the *Objection* must of necessity be understood of an *explicit habitual* Belief, (and not of an *implicit*, which is to be given to the most *obscure* and *least material* Truths in all the *Bible*) I demand, whether *every* Truth *clearly* manifested to the understanding of a sincere and diligent Reader of *Scripture* be a Point of Doctrine necessary to be *habitually* believed by him, or no? If it be answered no, as it must be, if rightly, (because an *habitual* knowledge of all Truths which will be *clear* to a very weak Capacity in the perusal of *Scripture*, is not attain-

attainable by *every* one, yea, perchance by *no one*) I further ask, what courſe is to be taken aſſuredly to know, *which* of all thoſe Myriads of Truths very *clearly* delivered in *Scripture* are of neceſſity to be *habitually* believed by the diligent ſincere Peruſer of it? The *Scripture* it ſelf no where tells us. Unleſs then there be ſome whoſe *Office* it is to ſhew, *what Divine truths* are neceſſary to be *habitually* believed, the Anſwer to my Queſtion muſt be this, that No Truths however *clearly* taught by *Scripture* are neceſſary to be *habitually* believed, but only *thoſe* which every ſincere and diligent Reader of it doth *himſelf* think to be ſo. Which admitting we ſhould ſuppoſe to be true; yet this would ſtill be further requiſite to be known, whether it of *Right* belongs to every ſuch Reader to judge what is *fundamental* and *neceſſary* to *all men*, or what is *fundamental* and *neceſſary* only to *himſelf*? If the former be true, to wit, that he has a *Right* to judge what is *fundamental*, and *neceſſary* to be *habitually* believed by *all men*, then will he be obliged to abſtain from Communion with every

one, who differs in judgment from him about any thing that he thinks to be a *fundamental* truth *clearly* contained in *Scripture*. Which becauſe we ſee to be practiſed by almoſt every diſtinct *Sect* in ſeparating *each* from *other*, and *all* of them from the *Church*, 'tis obvious to gather that the *Separatiſts* generally hold their *own Tenets* to be *neceſſary* to be believed not only by *themſelves*, but by *all others* likewiſe; and therefore, in caſe it be their juſt *Right* ſo to do, as many of them as ſeparate from thoſe (whoever they be) that differ from them in any thing which they eſteem *fundamental*, act *rationally* and *uprightly* therein; the Conſequence of which (but a very ſtrange one to proceed from a ſound Principle) will be plainly this, that all Societies of ſuch Sectaries however differing in Points of Faith among *themſelves* or from the *Church*, are notwithſtanding *right Chriſtian Orthodox Congregations*, and conſequently *true Members* of the *one Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church*, even while they refuſe and deſpiſe the *Communion* of of every *Chriſtian* which is not of their *own Sect*.

But

But in case it be said, that the sincere diligent Reader of *Scripture* has only a *Right* to judge what *Scriptural Truths* are necessary to be *explicitly* and *habitually* known and believed by *himself*, but not by *others*, then an Obligation will lye upon him to deny *Communion* to none, nor to refuse to *Communicate* with any *Professed Christian* for his Opinion of what Judgment soever; because *every* one having *Right* to judge for *himself* what is *fundamental*, but for *none besides*, No Person whatsoever could have *Right* to judge that *any other* person judged *amiss*; and consequently no man ought upon the account of *Doctrine*, to refuse *Communion* with any one Professing himself to be a *Christian*: so that it would be a manifest Injury to *Excommunicate* even for *Heresie* any one that holds and maintains his Opinion may be clearly proved by *Scripture*, although in truth it cannot. That this is exactly consequent to what hath been said, the Averment of the grand Maintainer of the Assertion, that *all things necessary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every understanding*, in consequence to

one, who differs in judgment from him about any thing that he thinks to be a *fundamental* truth *clearly* contained in *Scripture*. Which becauſe we ſee to be practiſed by almoſt every diſtinct *Sect* in ſeparating *each* from *other*, and *all* of them from the *Church*, 'tis obvious to gather that the *Separatiſts* generally hold their *own Tenets* to be *neceſſary* to be believed not only by *themſelves*, but by *all others* likewiſe; and therefore, in caſe it be their juſt *Right* ſo to do, as many of them as ſeparate from thoſe (whoever they be) that differ from them in any thing which they eſteem *fundamental*, act *rationally* and *uprightly* therein; the Conſequence of which (but a very ſtrange one to proceed from a ſound Principle) will be plainly this, that all Societies of ſuch Sectaries however differing in Points of Faith among *themſelves* or from the *Church*, are notwithſtanding *right Chriſtian Orthodox Congregations*, and conſequently *true Members* of the *one Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church*, even while they refuſe and deſpiſe the *Communion* of of every *Chriſtian* which is not of their *own Sect*.

But

But in caſe it be ſaid, that the ſincere diligent Reader of *Scripture* has only a *Right* to judge what *Scriptural Truths* are neceſſary to be *explicitly* and *habitually* known and believed by *himſelf*, but not by *others*, then an Obligation will lye upon him to deny *Communion* to none, nor to refuſe to *Communicate* with any *Profeſſed Chriſtian* for his Opinion of what Judgment ſoever; becauſe *every* one having *Right* to judge for *himſelf* what is *fundamental*, but for *none beſides*, No Perſon whatſoever could have *Right* to judge that *any other* perſon judged *amiſs*; and conſequently no man ought upon the account of *Doctrine*, to refuſe *Communion* with any one Profeſſing himſelf to be a *Chriſtian*: ſo that it would be a manifeſt Injury to *Excommunicate* even for *Hereſie* any one that holds and maintains his Opinion may be clearly proved by *Scripture*, although in truth it cannot. That this is exactly conſequent to what hath been ſaid, the Averment of the grand Maintainer of the Aſſertion, that *all things neceſſary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every underſtanding*, in conſequence

to

to that his Principle, assures me by the words here following; "He that be-" lieves the Scripture sincerely, and en-" deavours to believe it in the true sense," cannot possibly be an Heretick; and if " no more than this were required of any " man to make him capable of the " Churches Communion, then all men " so qualified, though they were different " in Opinion, yet notwithstanding any " such difference must be of necessity one " in Communion. The last lines of Mr. *Chillingworth*'s Preface to *the Author of Charity maintained.* And that he means not by these words [*endeavours to believe it in the true sense*] the best *endeavours* in a mans *power*, (which indeed may reach and extend to what the *Church*, as well as his own *thoughts* instructs him of the *sense* of *Holy Writ*) but an ordinary honest endeavour only, such as his leisure from worldly business, and his own skill and ability how mean soever will allow of, appears by the Lines ensuing; " I am " verily perswaded (saith he) that God " will not impute Errors to them as sins, " who use such a Measure of industry in " find-

" finding Truth, as humane Prudence and " ordinary diſcretion (their abilities and " opportunities, their diſtractions and " hinderances, and all other things con- " ſidered) ſhall adviſe them to in a mat- " ter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein " alſo we fail, then our Errors begin to " be malignant, and juſtly imputable as " offences againſt God, and that love of " Truth, which he requires in us. Mr. *Chil-lingworth* in his Anſwer to the Preface, *pag.* 19. 20. From this Diſcourſe of Mr. *Chillingworths*, I have the Teſtimony of him that doubtleſs underſtood his own Doctrine as well as any man, that my way of arguing in the *Sixth Section* of this Book is fairly laid againſt the Aſſer-tion, that *All things neceſſary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Underſtand-ing*; the drift of which Diſcourſe there made, to render my Meaning more per-ſpicuous, I'le reduce to *Form*, as here follows,

If all things neceſſary to Salvation be clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding, then would the Scripture be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one:

But

to that his Principle, assures me by the words here following; "He that be-"lieves the Scripture sincerely, and en-"deavours to believe it in the true sense, "cannot possibly be an Heretick; and if "no more than this were required of any "man to make him capable of the "Churches Communion, then all men "so qualified, though they were different "in Opinion, yet notwithstanding any "such difference must be of necessity one "in Communion. The last lines of Mr. *Chillingworth*'s Preface to *the Author of Charity maintained.* And that he means not by these words [*endeavours to believe it in the true sense*] the best *endeavours* in a mans *power*, (which indeed may reach and extend to what the *Church*, as well as his own *thoughts* instructs him of the *sense* of *Holy Writ*) but an ordinary honest endeavour only, such as his leisure from worldly business, and his own skill and ability how mean soever will allow of, appears by the Lines ensuing; "I am "verily perswaded (saith he) that God "will not impute Errors to them as sins, "who use such a Measure of industry in "find-

" finding Truth, as humane Prudence and " ordinary diſcretion (their abilities and " opportunities, their diſtractions and " hinderances, and all other things con- " ſidered) ſhall adviſe them to in a mat- " ter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein " alſo we fail, then our Errors begin to " be malignant, and juſtly imputable as " offences againſt God, and that love of " Truth, which he requires in us. Mr. *Chil-lingworth* in his Anſwer to the Preface, *pag.* 19. 20. From this Diſcourſe of Mr. *Chillingworths*, I have the Teſtimony of him that doubtleſs underſtood his own Doctrine as well as any man, that my way of arguing in the *Sixth Section* of this Book is fairly laid againſt the Aſſer-tion, that *All things neceſſary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Underſtand-ing*; the drift of which Diſcourſe there made, to render my Meaning more per-ſpicuous, I'le reduce to *Form*, as here follows,

If all things neceſſary to Salvation be clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding, then would the Scripture be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one:

But

But the Scripture is not the *Rule* of Faith *immediately* to every one: *Ergo*,

All things neceſſary to Salvation are not clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding.

The Minor proved.

If the Scripture be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one, then can no man be juſtly *Excommunicated* for any Error whatſoever, if after a diligent ſearch of Scripture he be fully perſwaded in his heart that his opinion is plainly contained therein;

But a man may be juſtly *Excommunicated* for ſome Error, whether, after a diligent ſearch of Scripture, he be fully perſwaded in his heart, or not, that his Opinion is plainly contained therein: *Ergo*,

The Scripture is not the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one.

The proof of the Aſſumption is to be ſeen in *Sect.* 6.

And

And for the *Propoſition*, the truth thereof is grounded on this, that, if *Scripture* be ſuppoſed to be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one, it muſt be every mans *Rule*, not as it appears clear to this or that *third* Perſon, or to *any Society* of men whatſoever; but as it ſeems plain to his *own* Underſtanding: which therefore ſo long as he deviates not from in maintaining any Opinion, which after a diligent ſearch of *Scripture* he ſtedfaſtly thinks to be clearly contain'd therein, he follows the *Rule of Faith*, for doing of which no man queſtionleſs, ought to be *Excommunicated.*

Some to evade this would peradventure ſay, that no man after a diligent ſearch of *Scripture*, can poſſibly maintain any *Error* oppoſite to a Point of *Faith*, but in contradiction to his own Judgment; ſo that the Reaſon why there are ſo many different Sects, and ſuch diverſity of *Opinions* in *Matters* of *Faith*, is not becauſe the Neceſſaries to Salvation are not *clearly* taught in *Scripture* to the apprehenſion of every *Ordinary* Capacity; but becauſe *ſome* for want of an humble,

But the Scripture is not the *Rule* of Faith *immediately* to every one: *Ergo*,

All things neceſſary to Salvation are not clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding.

The Minor proved.

If the Scripture be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one, then can no man be juſtly *Excommunicated* for any Error whatſoever, if after a diligent ſearch of Scripture he be fully perſwaded in his heart that his opinion is plainly contained therein:

But a man may be juſtly *Excommunicated* for ſome Error, whether, after a diligent ſearch of Scripture, he be fully perſwaded in his heart, or not, that his Opinion is plainly contained therein: *Ergo*,

The Scripture is not the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one.

The proof of the Aſſumption is to be ſeen in *Sect.* 6.

And

And for the *Propoſition*, the truth thereof is grounded on this, that, if *Scripture* be ſuppoſed to be the Rule of Faith *immediately* to every one, it muſt be every mans *Rule*, not as it appears clear to this or that *third* Perſon, or to *any Society* of men whatſoever; but as it ſeems plain to his *own* Underſtanding: which therefore ſo long as he deviates not from in maintaining any Opinion, which after a diligent ſearch of *Scripture* he ſtedfaſtly thinks to be clearly contain'd therein, he follows the *Rule of Faith*, for doing of which no man queſtionleſs, ought to be *Excommunicated.*

Some to evade this would peradventure ſay, that no man after a diligent ſearch of *Scripture*, can poſſibly maintain any *Error* oppoſite to a Point of *Faith*, but in contradiction to his own Judgment; ſo that the Reaſon why there are ſo many different Sects, and ſuch diverſity of *Opinions* in *Matters* of *Faith*, is not becauſe the Neceſſaries to Salvation are not *clearly* taught in *Scripture* to the apprehenſion of every *Ordinary* Capacity; but becauſe *ſome* for want of an humble,

humble, ſincere, diligent reading of it, attain not to that knowledge of Truth they *might* eaſily do; and *others* through Pride, Paſſion or Intereſt will not acknowledge what they really *believe*; both which ſince they are αὐτοκατάκριτοι, the former in reſpect of their *wilful ignorance*; the latter in regard of their *perverſe denial* of a known Truth, may juſtly be *Excommunicated* for holding and maintaining an *Error* in *Faith*; and ſo *Scripture*, for any thing yet ſaid to the contrary, may be the *Rule of Faith immediately* to *every one*.

To this *Reply*, which conſiſts of ſeveral parts, ſeveral things muſt be applyed in *Anſwer*. To the firſt part therefore I make return by granting that every one may come to the knowledge of all Neceſſary Truths by a *right uſe* of *Holy Writ*; but what the leaſt Reaſon is there to think that thoſe *ignorant* people read it with that *humility*, *ſincerity*, and *diligence* they ought to do, who meeting with ſeeming *Contradictions* about the *Bleſſed Trinity*, Juſtification, *&c.* and finding it writ, *Swear not at all*; *Thou ſhalt not*

not kill, with other *Texts* apt to be miſtaken, boldly adventure to cull out of *Scripture* of themſelves a *Religion*; and do not rather conſult the *Rulers of the Church* to be inſtructed what has been the conſtant *Belief* of *Catholick Chriſtians* in all Ages, (which if not only they, but even the greateſt Doctors in the World ſwerve from, they for certain fall into Error concerning the *Faith*) when as in ſtead of finding any ſuch Text that *all things neceſſary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding*, they read in plain words, *Obey them that have the Rule over you and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your Souls as they that muſt give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief*, *Hebr.* 13. 17. And again, *Take heed to your ſelves and to all the Flock, over the which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you Overſeers to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own Bloud*, *Acts* 20. 28. eſpecially when they are told by S. *Peter*, that in his brother *Paul*'s Epiſtles are ſome things *hard* to be underſtood, which the *unlearned* and *unſtable* wreſt, as they do alſo *other Scriptures*, unto their own

own *deſtruction.* And when beſides they ſee that to abſtain from things offered to *Idols*, and from *blood*, and from things *ſtrangled*, are all of them without any difference aſſigned, ſaid to be *things neceſſary* and enjoyned by the Apoſtles as *ſuch*, *Acts* 15. 28, 29. Theſe Conſiderations (to omit many more, which upon a ſmall enquiry would offer themſelves) plainly diſcover it to be *Arrogancy*, not *Humility*; *Preſumption* not *Prudence*, in that *ignorant Perſon*, who thinks his own fanſied *Abilities* ſufficient to direct him in *Matters* of *Salvation*; either neglecting or contemning the *Guidance* and *Authority* of the *Rulers* of the *Church* and *Overſeers* of the *Flock of Chriſt.*

To the *Second* part of the *Reply*, (*viz.* that ſome men through Pride, Paſſion, or Intereſt deny what they really believe) I anſwer, that albeit I fear too many do ſo, yet I ſee no cauſe to think, "that all "thoſe who uſe ſuch a meaſure of Indu-"ſtry in finding Truth as humane Pru-"dence and Ordinary Diſcretion, their "abilities and opportunities, their di-"ſtractions and hinderances, and all other things

" things consider'd) shall advise them " unto in a matter of such consequence, do *wittingly* and *wilfully* bely their own thoughts, at what time soever they oppose the *Doctrine* of the *Church*. It were too great *uncharitableness* (to style it no worse) to accuse all such of that height of horrid Impiety, especially if we reflect that diverse of them deny it under afflictions till death.

To the last Part of the *Reply* (which rightly supposes that all men must be *Self condemned* in respect either of *wilful ignorance*, or else of *denying* a *known truth* who maintain an *Error* in *Faith*, (if indeed what they say were true, to wit, that *all things necessary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Understanding*) and consequently that they might be justly *Excommunicated* whenever they opposed any *Catholick Truth*) I give in Answer, that since it is a peculiar *Prerogative* of the *Almighty* to know the *Secrets* of *Mans Heart*, the *Church* cannot without high *Presumption* inflict the Penalty of *Excommunication* upon any *Man* on this account, that he denies a *known Truth*, contrary to

the moſt ſolemn *Proteſtation* he can make to give them aſſurance he doth not; or that he has neglected to uſe ſuch Induſtry as is required by Mr. *Chillingworth* for finding out *Truth* in *Scripture*, when he himſelf averrs in the moſt ſerious manner poſſible he has outdone that ſincere diligence which Mr. *Chillingworth* requires. The *Church* grounds her *Denunciations* againſt *Hereticks* not on ſuch *uncertain* and ſometimes (no doubt) falſe ſurmiſes, but on this *ſure Bottom*, that they maintain an *Error* contrary to ſome *Doctrine* which has in all ſucceſſive Ages ever ſince the Apoſtles been held to be an *Article* of *Faith*; either expreſly contained in Scripture, or by neceſſary conſequence deducible from it. So that *Holy Church* has no need of ſuch a pitiful ſhift to juſtifie her Proceedings by, in *Excommunicating* of *Hereticks*, to ſay, that they act againſt their *own Conſcience*; and yet this, they muſt ſay, that all *Hereticks* do, who aſſert that *all things neceſſary to Salvation are clear in Scripture to every Underſtanding*; which whether it be not a meer *precarious* ſaying, (not to call it falſe)

I appeal to any impartial man to be judge.

*Object.*2. You write *Sect.*9. that the *Fundamentals* of *Christian Religion* are *more*, than those *Divine Truths* which are so necessary that not any *one* Chrjstian can be saved without an *expreſs* belief of them, and there give a tolerable account of the Verity of that your Assertion. But seeing nevertheless, you had said before in the same *Section*, that the very *Ground* and *Reason* why some Scriptural Doctrines are called *necessary* in contradistinction to others not esteemed so, is from hence, that they are held necessary to be *plainly* understood, to the intent, the *Credenda* of them may be *explicitly* believed, the *Agenda* may be *frequently* practised in order to *Salvation*, I cannot reconcile these Two Assertions of yours together.

Anſ. The Reason why you cannot, I conjecture may be this, that, whereas I say that some Scriptural Doctrines in contradistinction to others, are therefore called *necessary*, because they are necessary to be *plainly* understood, to the intent the *Credenda* may be *explicitly* believed, and the *Agenda* frequently practised in order

to *Salvation*, you apprehend me to mean by theſe laſt words [*in order to Salvation*] the ſame, as if I had ſaid, *in order to the Salvation of every individual Soul whatſoever*, which I never intended, (as you'l eaſily perceive by a Review of that Paragraph in the *9th Section*, where the Penitent Thief is mentioned.) For although the *Fundamental Points* of Chriſtianity are held by ſome to be only thoſe, the *expreſs* knowledge whereof every *ſingle* adult Chriſtian muſt have that will be ſaved; yet you no where find that Notion of *Fundamentals* to be mine, having ever thought it a thing impoſſible to *know* what is *fundamental to particular perſons*. But in regard it is a neceſſary Qualification of the *Rule of Faith* that it comprehend *all things neceſſary to the Salvation of Mankind under innumerable different conditions and various Circumſtances in the world placed and conſidered*, what I call *Fundamentals* are ſuch Truths as are requiſite to be *Univerſally* taught and inculcated by the *Paſtors* of the *Church*, that they may be *generally* known and embraced; *every one* of which notwithſtanding

ing though this, or that *particular* perſon, through ſome Accident or other (not accompanied with *perverſeneſs* of *Mind*) ſhall peradventure not *explicitly* believe; yet I dare not affirm that for ſuch *accidental omiſſion*, *unaffected Ignorance*, or *involuntary non-belief*, he ſhall be deprived of *everlaſting Bliſs*. So that *Fundamental points* in the ſenſe I take them are *all* thoſe grand Doctrines of the Goſpel of *Chriſt*, which *eſſentially* contribute to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, the *truth* of *any one* whereof whoſoever publickly *denies* and *perſiſts* in, the *Church* not only *lawfully* may, but is even *obliged* to deprive him of her *Communion*. Of this ſort are principally thoſe Truths contained in the *Apoſtolical Creed* explained by the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian*; the *oppoſite errors* whereunto either by *immediate* direct *contradiction*; or by *neceſſary* and *apparent conſequence* the *Church* ought to denounce an *Anathema* againſt. But who dare notwithſtanding peremptorily ſay, that *every Chriſtian* who *expreſly* believes not each *particular* Truth to which *ſuch errors* are repugnant, ſhall not go to *Hea-*

ven, but muſt ſink down to *Hell*? Secret Judgments (as that of the determining of the *final ſtate* of mens *Souls*) are of Right reſerved to *God*. The *end* deſigned by *Anathema*'s againſt *Heretical Doctrines* is to *deterr* men from *Hereſie*. And the Churches *intent* in actually Excommunicating *Heretical Perſons* is chiefly to reduce them to a *ſound mind*, but (if that cannot be effected) however to remove them from the *Society* of the *Faithful*, (ſo far as the Church has power to do it) that they be not *corrupted* by them; and not to deliver them up to the Devil for their utter *deſtruction*. The Churches *Diſcipline* is altogether *Medicinal*, & never to be exerciſed with an Intent to *deſtroy*, but always to *ſave* mens *precious Souls*. And therefore the Confidence we ſomewhere meet with in demanding a Reaſon to be given, *Why the Church ſhould deny her Communion, for the holding of an error for which God would not deny Heaven*, is, in my thoughts, much greater than there appears any juſt Motive for encourageing the demander thereunto. For ſince the thing aimed at by *Excommunication* is not

not to *exclude* men from, but to *bring* them to *Beatitude*; and that, although the *expreſs belief* of each *particular Fundamental* be not *abſolutely* neceſſary to every *ſingle* mans *Salvation*, yet is undoubtedly neceſſary to be *retained* among *Chriſtians*, the *Church* may *juſtly* inflict her *Cenſure* upon any one that rejects an *Article* of *Catholick Faith*, or what is an *immediate manifeſt conſequent* of it, notwithſtanding that it would be great *Temerity* to aſſert that ſuch an Excommunicated Perſon would infallibly be *damned*, unleſs through ſome *vicious* inclination he *obſtinately* refuſed to deſert his *Error*, after the Churches *known Cenſure*, and died in that *Obſtinacy*. For inſtance, who would not think that man very raſhly cenſorious, that ſhould adjudge one to Hell for the *meer Error* of holding Chriſt to have but *one Will*, whenas he *rightly* apprehends and believes he is but *one Perſon*? And yet a *Monothelite* doubtleſs ought to be denyed the Churches *Communion*, unleſs he'l retract his Error, becauſe the maintaining *one* only *Will* in *Chriſt* neceſſarily leads by *direct* and *clear conſe-*

quence to the denyal of *two Natures* in *Chriſt*, or that *He* is truly *God* and *Man*.

Object. 3. 'Tis your own Aſſertion, *Sect.* 12. That the *Holy Scripture* is the *Rule of Chriſtian Faith*: And if ſo, then ſince every individual perſon is to believe for *himſelf*, and that there is no *abſolute* certainty to be had of *Matters of Faith* but from the *Rule of Faith*, every one muſt learn his Religion *immediately* from *Scripture* of himſelf, or elſe be in hazard to be *deceived* in that which concerns his *everlaſting Salvation*.

Anſ. The only *abſolute* certainty to be had of *Matters of Faith* is indeed from the *Rule of Faith* (which is *Scripture*) rightly underſtood. But that every one muſt learn them of *himſelf* from *Scripture*, or elſe be in hazard to be *deceived*, I ſee no Cauſe at all to yield unto, unleſs the knowledg of *all neceſſary truths* be more *certainly* attainable from *Scripture* by the ignorant multitude, (ſome of which being *illiterate* perſons cannot learn their Religion *immediately* from the *Sacred Text*; and moſt of them being unskilled in the *Original Tongues* wherein *Scripture* was writ, muſt

credit

credit others for the *truth* of the *Version* in which they read it) than by their learned *Spiritual Guides*, who by the *Constitution* of the *Christian Dispensation* are appointed to *instruct* them. If you ask in what? In *necessaries* to *Salvation* without doubt in the *first* place, since to them it belongs by *Divine Institution* (as both by the *Treatise* and *Appendix* has been shewn) to tell what the *Fundamentals of Christianity*, or the *Terms* of *Communion* in *Essentials* to the *Churches Constitution* be, and upon the piously professed Belief thereof by the People to admit them *Members* of the *Catholick Church*, and not *otherwise*. For in case every one professing *Christianity* should be *admitted* and *owned* a *Member* of *Christs Church* upon such *Terms* as he himself would require, a necessity of expunging out of the *Creed* the belief of *one Holy Cathylick* and *Apostolick Church* would thereupon ensue; because the Maintainers of *contradictory* Propositions about *Articles of Faith*, (as that *Christ is God consubstantial with the Father*, and *not consubstantial with the Father*; *Christ has two Natures in one Person*, and *not two Natures*

tures in one person, &c.) do not believe *one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Faith*, and 'tis in respect of the Belief and Profession of *one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Faith*, that the *Society* of *Christians* is called *one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church.*

Object. 4. Thou saidst in *Sect.* 5. that those who will have the *Light within* to be the *Rule of Faith* and *Manners*, must prove the *truth* of the *Doctrine* it teaches by *Miracles.* In opposition whereunto we offer, first, that in case there were need thereof, the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, & the *Doctrine* which the *Light within* teaches being the *same*, the *same Miracles* which confirmed the *Doctrine* of the *Letter* confirms the *Doctrine* of the *Spirit* also. But 2*ly* we say, there is no necessity of granting, that we ought to prove *our Doctrine* by *Miracles*; for we demand of Thee to declare thy Mind freely, *Whether all that were led by the Spirit of God, and were thereby made able to instruct others, were workers of Miracles?*

Ans. Although the *Doctrine* which you say the *Spirit within* teaches, were exactly the same with the *Doctrine* taught in the *H. Scripture*, (which by the way we deny) yet

yet seeing you hold the *Light within* to be the *Rule of Faith*, the *truth* of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture* must be tryed by the *truth* of the *Doctrine* which the *Light within* discovers, (because the *truth* of every Doctrine whatsoever alledged to be *Christian* ought for certain to be tryed by the *Rule of Christian Faith*) But it is absurd to say that the *truth* of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture* ought to be tryed by the *truth* of the *Doctrine* which the *Light within* discovers, except the *Doctrine* which the *Light within* discovers have as *good Testimony* for the proof of its *Verity*, as the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture* has for the *certainty* of its *truth*. If you say, that *your Doctrine* needs not the Attestation of *Miracles*, because it is the very *same* with the *Doctrine* of *Christ* contained in *Scripture* which was confirmed by *Miracles*, and will abide by what you say, we shall desire no more; for in giving that *Reason*, you tacitly own that *Miracles* are necessary for ascertaining the *Verity* of your *Doctrine* by, and that you have none other to shew but those which were done by our *Saviour* for the Con-

firm-

firmation of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*; in doing of which two things, I appeal to any unprejudiced perſon whether you muſt not by neceſſary Conſequence yield that the *certainty* of the *truth* of your *Doctrine* depends upon the *Certainty* of the *truth* of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, and thence be forced to aknowledge that the *Written word* is the *Rule of Chriſtian Faith*, and that *your Doctrine* therefore is to *ſtand* or *fall* as it is found to be agreeable or diſagreeable *thereunto*. But this diſadvantage to your Cauſe you ſeem to be not totally unaware of, by the putting of this *Querie*; *Whether all that were led by the Spirit of God, and were thereby made able to inſtruct others, were workers of Miracles?* To this I anſwer, that the *Spirit of God* at the firſt preaching of the Goſpel by the Apoſtles was given for *ſeveral ends*; ſome had the *Spirit* given to enable them to ſpeak with *ſtrange tongues*; ſome to empower them to *cure diſeaſes*; others that they might *Propheſie* and *foretel* things to come, *&c.* ſo that every one who had the *Spirit*, had it not purpoſely beſtowed on him to teach the *Doctrine* of

Ever-

Everlasting Salvation by. The Question therefore is not fairly put. If it had been thus, *Whether an Obligation lye upon men to believe one who pretends an immediate Light from God for teaching other certain things revealed to him by Inspiration, without proving his Authority for the same by Miracles*; if I say, the question had been thus put, I would (as you require) have declared my mind freely, that there lies *no obligation* on them at all; because no Testimony less than *Miracles* would in such case be sufficient. An *immediate Commission* from *God* requires *immediate Witness* from *Heaven. Extraordinary* things must have *extraordinary* proof. It is impossible that any should give *convincing* Testimony of the truth of that which none is privy to besides God, but *God* alone. Hence were drawn those *unanswerable* words in behalf of the assured truth thereof, from the infallible Mouth of the *Son of God* professing he was sent by his *Father* to *declare* his *Will*, while he said, *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had had no sin. John* 15. 24.

Object.

Object. 5. Your Arguments againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* grounded on *extenſion* are not ſo mighty, as they look big; for if you be acquainted with the *School-men*, they'l tell you there is a twofold extenſion *entitative* and *quantitative*; the former is ſaid to be *extenſio partium in ordine ad ſe*; the latter *extenſio partium in ordine ad locum*. What you labour to prove is, that *quantitative* Extenſion and *Tranſubſtantiation* are utterly inconſiſtent; which if it be granted you, yet ſo long as *Tranſubſtantiation* may conſiſt with *entitative* extenſion, your Arguments reach not their intended mark in confuting the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, if ſo be *Chriſts Body* in the Sacrament hath only *entitative*, and not *quantitative* extenſion, as it is affirmed by many learned men of our Church that it hath.

Anſ. *Chriſts Body* in the *Sacred Hoſt*, if the ſame (as you hold it is) with his Body on the Croſs, conſiſts of *Organical*, and conſequently of *heterogeneous parts*, becauſe otherwiſe the *Nature* of the Eye, the Ear, the Mouth, the Hand, the Fleſh, the Bones, *&c.* would be nothing *different*,

rent, but the *ſame*. Suppoſe we then, the Eye, the Ear, the Mouth, the Hand, the Fleſh, the Bones, *&c.* to be *diſtinct* from one another with that extenſion your *Schools* call *entitative*; yet that ſame *entitative* extenſion (let them underſtand by it what they pleaſe) muſt of neceſſity be commenſurate, or not commenſurate to ſome place; if it be commenſurate to any place, then is it *quantitative*, and ſo my Arguments againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* grounded on *extenſion* will ſtand good. But if *entitative extenſion* be not commenſurate to any *ſpace* whatſoever, then where the Eye is, there is alſo the Ear; where the Ear, the Mouth; and where any one Member of the Body is, there will likewiſe every other part of the whole body be; which in caſe it were really ſo, there would be a *mutual penetration* of all the Members; whereas *Penetration* is ſo repugnant to the *Nature* of *Corporeal* ſubſtance, that if it were not *incompetible* with it, the whole *Univerſe* of *Material Being* might ſubſiſt together in an *indiviſible* Point. Beſides (to ſhew you further how frivolous the diſtinc-

distinction of *entitative* and *quantitative* extension is) the supposed *entitative* extension of the Eye, either has a figure *different* from the *entitative* extension of the Ear, (and the like is to be said of every other Organ of the Body) or it has not; if it have not, whence I pray comes the *difference* of Organs in mans Body? if it have a *different* figure, it has a *different Determination* of *quantitative* extension, seeing *Figure* arises from the *Determination* of *Quantity*, and the several distinct *sorts* of figure, from the several distinct *Modes* of the Determination thereof.

AN

AN EXPLANATION OF THE Several *Acceptations*, in which the Word *TRADITION* is Uſed in the Foregoing Book.

BEing given to Underſtand that ſome things in the mentioned Book have been *miſapprehended* by reaſon of the word *Tradition* often uſed in it, but in *different* places (accordingly as the Matter in hand required) in a *different* ſence, I thought it might not prove unuſeful to *explain* the ſeveral *Acceptations* in which it is to be underſtood in the whole *Treatiſe*, and preſent them all together, to be ſeen as it were at one view.

In ſome places of the Book, by *Tradition* is meant, *the Living Voice of the Church*, as comprehending theſe Two Branches, *viz.* that *The Church in every Age teaches all the Articles of Catholick Faith as derived to it by a ſtill continued Oral and Practical delivery of them ever ſince the days of the Apoſtles. And*

distinction of *entitative* and *quantitative* extension is) the supposed *entitative* extension of the Eye, either has a figure *different* from the *entitative* extension of the Ear, (and the like is to be said of every other Organ of the Body) or it has not; if it have not, whence I pray comes the *difference* of Organs in mans Body? if it have a *different* figure, it has a *different Determination* of *quantitative* extension, seeing *Figure* arises from the *Determination* of *Quantity*, and the several distinct *sorts* of figure, from the several distinct *Modes* of the Determination thereof.

AN

AN EXPLANATION OF THE Several *Acceptations*, in which the Word *TRADITION* is Uſed in the Foregoing Book.

BEing given to Underſtand that ſome things in the mentioned Book have been *miſapprehended* by reaſon of the word *Tradition* often uſed in it, but in *different* places (accordingly as the Matter in hand required) in a *different* ſence, I thought it might not prove unuſeful to *explain* the ſeveral *Acceptations* in which it is to be underſtood in the whole *Treatiſe*, and preſent them all together, to be ſeen as it were at one view.

In ſome places of the Book, by *Tradition* is meant, *the Living Voice of the Church*, as comprehending theſe Two Branches, *viz.* that *The Church in every Age teaches all the Articles of Catholick Faith as derived to it by a ſtill continued Oral and Practical delivery of them ever ſince the days of the Apoſtles. And*

that whatsoever is taught by the Present Church of any one Age as an Article of Catholick Faith, the same has been always held for such without interruption from the first settlement of Christianity in the world. *Tradition* thus taken some Learned *Romanists* assert to be the *only certain Rule* by which men are to judge *what Doctrines* are *Points of Catholick Faith*; but we reject it as not safe to rely upon, for which I have endeavoured to shew cause in the preceding *Treatise.*

Otherwhile *Tradition* is somewhere used to signifie *the perpetually continued delivery of certain particular Doctrines said to have been taught by the Apostles, but not committed to Writing by them.* Which Doctrines go by the name of *Apostolical Traditions* and are made part of the *Doctrine of Salvation* by the *Romish Church*, but refused by *ours*, which holds that the *Written word* of *God* contains in it (either *expresly*, or by *necessary* and *apparent consequence*) *all things necessary to Salvation.*

Again, by *Tradition* elsewhere is intended, *That Conveyance of the Canonical Books of Scripture, by which they have in every Age since they were first Writ, been constantly re-*

recommended to the world to be of Divine Authority, which is in ſhort, *the hiſtorical Tradition of the Canonical Books of Holy Writ.*

Laſtly, *Tradition* is beſides made uſe of to denote *The perpetual delivery of Chriſts Doctrine by teaching, profeſſing, and practiſing of it without intermiſſion in all Ages of the Church from its firſt Plantation to the Worlds end.* Now in which of the forementioned ſenſes *Tradition* ought in the ſeveral places where it is uſed in the Book, to be taken, it will be eaſie from the Deſcriptions given to underſtand.

In the Two laſt mentioned *Acceptations* of *Tradition*, although I have ſhewn before in the Book, the great Benefit thereof to the *Church*; yet I will here add ſomething more for the fuller confirmation of the incomparable uſefulneſs of it in both *ſenſes* thereunto.

Firſt then, as to the *Hiſtorical Tradition* of the *Canon of Scripture*, the advantage we have by it, is ſo very conſiderable, that there's no way (without an immediate *Revelation*) to be aſcertain'd, that the Books called *Canonical Scripture* are an

authentick Record of Gods revealed Will to Man, if we reject the *Teſtimony thereof*. For unleſs the *Scripture* be a true *hiſtorical Relation* of the things *contained* in it, 'tis in vain to go about to prove from *internal Arguments* its *Divine Authority*. And that the *Scripture* is a *true Hiſtory* of the things *contained* in it, the *Scripture* cannot of *it ſelf* ſufficiently warrant us, ſince it is not the bare *Writing*, but the Writing according to *truth*, that affords a *true hiſtorical Relation*. And the *Author* of any Book, let the *Contents* of it be never ſo *falſe*, may, if he pleaſe, aſſert therein, that all he has *written* ought to be received for certain and unqueſtionable *Truth*. Hence it was that Mr. *Chillingworth* in his Book againſt *K. Part.* 1. *Ch.* 2. *n.* 46. makes this return to him (not without ſome ſhew of Indignation) " The Concluſion of your Tenth *Sect.* is, " That *the Divinity of a Writing cannot be* " *known from it ſelf alone, but by ſome extrin-* " *ſecal Authority*; which you need not " prove, for no wiſe man denies it. But " then this Authority is that of *Univerſal* " *Tradition*, not of your Church, for to me " it is altogether as αὐτόπιστον, that the Go-

" ſpel

" ſpel of St. *Matthew* is the Word of God, " as that all which your Church ſays is " true. By this it appears that there is the like Neceſſity of *Hiſtorical Tradition* in the *Church*, as there is of having a *rational aſſurance* of the *Canonical Books* of *Sacred Writ*, becauſe by that we arrive at this.

And as for *Tradition*, when it is taken for the ſame with the *perpetual delivery of Chriſt's Doctrine by a ſtill continued teaching, profeſſing and practiſing of it in all Ages while the world laſts*, it is of that *neceſſary* concern to *Chriſtianity*, that whenever or wherever it *ceaſes*, the *Viſible Church* (which is a *Society of People profeſſing and practiſing Chriſt's Doctrine*) muſt inevitably then and there determine together with it. The conſideration of which evident truth induced Mr. *Chillingworth* when he was asked by his *Adverſary*, "*What Viſible Church there* "*was before* Luther *diſagreeing from the* "Roman? to ſay, I anſwer, that before "*Luther* there were many Viſible "Churches in many things diſagreeing "from the *Roman*; but not that the whole "Catholick Church diſagreed from her, "becauſe ſhe her ſelf was a part of the

"whole, though much corrupted. And "to undertake to name a Catholick "Church disagreeing from her, is to make "her no part of it, which we do not, nor "need not pretend. Mr. *Chillingworth* in the *Answer* to the *Preface*, *pag.* 15. *n.* 19. And again *Part* 1. *Ch.* 3. *n.* 11. he writeth thus, "*Your Will is, we should remember that* "*Christ must always have a Visible Church.* "*Answer*, Your pleasure shall be obeyed "on condition you will not forget that "there is a difference between perpetual "*Visibility* and perpetual *Purity*. As for "the *Answer* which you make for us, true "it is, we believe the *Catholick Church can-* "*not perish*, yet that she may and did err in "Points not Fundamental, and that Pro- "testants were obliged to forsake those "Errors of the Church, as they did, "though not the Church for her Errors, "for that they did not, but continued still "Members of the Church. For it is not "all one (though you perpetually con- "found them) to *forsake* the *Errors* of the "*Church*, and to *forsake* the *Church*: or to "*forsake* the *Church in her Errors*, and "*simply to forsake the Church*; no more than

"it

"it is for me to renounce my Brothers or "my Friends Vices or Errors, and to re- "nounce my Brother or Friend. The for- "mer was done by Proteſtants, the latter "was not done. There will then,'tis plain, be a *Viſible Church*, or a *Society of People profeſſing and practiſing Chriſts Doctrine*, till the Conſummation of all things. Nor, if it were objected, that the *Perpetuity* of the *Church* depends upon the *efficacious Power* of our *Saviours Promiſe* to *abide* with it to the *end* of the *World*, would it make any thing at all againſt what I have ſaid. For that ſame *efficacious Power* is the *Principal efficient Cauſe* of the *Churches Preſervation* and *Continuance*; the *perpetual teaching, profeſſing, and practiſing Chriſts Doctrine*, or *Oral* and *Practical Tradition*, is only a *neceſſary means*, or *ſubſervient intermediate Cauſe* by which *Chriſt* the *Chief cauſe* effects the *Preſervation* and *Continuance* of the *Viſible Church*.

From this *perpetual practical Conveyance of Chriſts Doctrine*, two things of grand Importance in relation to the *Rule of Faith* come to paſs. For *firſt*, we have very great and ſtrong *aſſurance* of the Preſervation of the